c.12230.13

MAN NOT IMMORTAL:

A REVIEW OF

"REV." N. D. GEORGE ON ANNIHILATION.

BY

LEONARD C. THORNE,

EDITOR OF THE HERALD OF LIFE.

"All the wicked will" God "*destroy*."—Psa. cxlv. 20.

For they "shall be punished with *everlasting destruction*."—2 Thess. i. 9.

"The wages of sin is *death*; but the *gift* of God is *eternal life*, through Jesus Christ our Lord."—Rom. vi. 23.

"Christ . . . hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."—2 Tim. i. 10.

"And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will *raise him up at the last day*."—John vi. 40.

"Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me."—Rev. xxii. 12.

17

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
COPYRIGHT
12230

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICE OF THE HERALD OF LIFE,

121 NASSAU ST.

1871.

BT930
G5T4

ENTERED according to Act of Congress, in the year 1871, by
LEONARD C. THORNE,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress,
at Washington.

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON

37-39338

PREFACE.

ISAAC TAYLOR, a learned and justly eminent Christian writer, has said, with how much truth an already large and still increasing number of studious ones well know, that, "When once this weighty question of the after life has been opened, and when it shall have come into the hands of well-informed biblical interpreters, a controversy will ensue, in the progress of which it will be discovered that, with unobservant eyes, we and our predecessors have been so walking up and down, and running hither and thither, among dim notices and indications of the future destinies of the human family, as to have failed to gather up or regard much that has lain upon the pages of the Bible open and free to our use." The truth concerning man's nature and destiny is, we are compelled to believe, an essential part of the much that very many Christians "have failed to gather up," although it has lain upon the pages of the Bible open and free to their use.

To a consideration of the weighty question of the future destinies of the race this work is devoted; and the importance of reaching just conclusions is augmented, if possible, by the fact that they involve a determination of the great question of duration of evil. Experience has shown, it is believed, that there is no view concerning the doom of the impenitent which is so eminently calculated not only to impress the mind with the immeasurable advantages of conformity to divine requirements, but also to incite love to the Creator, as that of reduction of the persistently rebellious to non-existence, when it is seen that against that state is set an eternal life of blessedness, to be had upon the simple condition of obedience. And yet not a few candid minds think they see in a contemplation of the final destruction of evil, the removal of a real and proper restraint. What is the truth of the matter? should first be settled, for surely the truth, whatever it is, and however antagonistic to our prejudices, is altogether beneficial, while error must of necessity be otherwise.

The doctrine of eternal existence of sin exalts the sinner, while that of extinction of evil by the extinction of evil doers, degrades him. It is unquestionably true that there is a certain dignity about an eternal persistence in sin; and both sin and its punishment—if the punishment be conscious suffering—cease, to a great extent, to be degrading when they become immortal.

A deep thinker has justly remarked: "The conception of a wickedness thoroughly consistent, ever persistent, and eternally subsistent, is intrinsically admirable and sublime. Endless guilt implies the POWER to sin and rebel forever; and endless woe implies the CAPACITY to suffer forever. It is a God-like faculty, if one can say to evil, 'be thou my good,' with a purpose that cannot be broken through the lapse of eternal ages. . . . A mightier power may imprison and restrain him" (the sinner); "but if an unconquerable will can still revolt, the power of eternal anguish sustains the dignity. The dignity is enhanced, if one may contend forever with justice, and tantalize retribution, by adding sin to sin, and still more, if one may ever grow in fiendish capacity and malignity. If there be such rebels, they may certainly glory in the prerogative of imposing burdens, if not cares, upon the divine administration."

In settling all questions respecting man's destiny, the word of God is the only just and true standard of appeal. Overlooking this fact, in some important particulars, Christians have fallen into grave and dangerous errors. Therefore, "to the law and to the testimony."

MAN NOT IMMORTAL.

REVIEW OF "REV." N. D. GEORGE ON ANNIHILATION.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.—THE PENALTY OF SIN.

WHAT is man, and what is his relation to the Creator? Does some peculiar fact or quality of his nature entitle him to endless existence? or does a provision of divine law place an unending life within his reach? In brief, is man immortal, or is he a candidate for immortality? These are incomparably the most momentous questions that can engage human attention. In seeking right answers to them man is happily not left to speculation, the word of God affording the needed instruction. What the Scriptures teach on these points will, we trust, be clearly shown in the course of this investigation.

Although the author of the work under consideration has introduced no new argument against the unity of man's nature, his unconsciousness in death, and the literal destruction of the finally impenitent; nor, consequently, adduced any thing in support of the theory of inherent or natural immortality which has not already been repeatedly presented and refuted, he has dashed into the subject at some points with a boldness not unfrequently bordering upon recklessness,

often evincing, seemingly, a determination to sustain at all hazards certain notions, even where the current of Scripture testimony sets so strongly, nay overwhelmingly against them as to baffle and turn to utter nought the most skilled and learned efforts to so much as create a ripple on the surface of its calm, majestic flow. Whenever he has met with an opposing argument that is susceptible of being by any adroit manœuvre turned from its proper and legitimate course, and carried to ludicrous conclusions, he has diligently sought to accomplish it. This style of warfare must, as all know, to effect its purpose, be waged with both ability and dexterity; but so far from this, his movements in that direction are, as must be apparent to any practiced eye, usually so clumsily effected and fall so far short of their aim, that they can be said to rise no higher than mere attempts, and must be seen by even casual observers to recoil upon the theory in the interests of which they are instituted. Some Scripture passages, that must ever be regarded by unbiased minds as arraying themselves in opposition to the popular theological views on the subject named, are confronted and treated in a manner clearly indicative of misapprehension, while others, mighty bulwarks of truth, are left untouched because, seemingly, to touch them would be to bring his theory and the truth into a strikingly unfavorable contrast.

Before proceeding further let us consider certain of his plainly stated propositions. On page 184, he says: "We remark, too, that physical death is not the penalty of sin." Again, p. 191: "And also that death, when threatened as a penalty, is not extinction, but conscious suffering." It is "spiritual death."—P. 189.

There is no better understood nor more rigidly observed rule in the creation of penal laws than is that of defining the penalty of violation by the use of terms the most unambiguous, comprehensible and unequivocal; nor is there a principle more strictly regarded in any department of human action than that which, in the establishment of the *penal code,* makes the penalty proportionate to the offense. This principle was not always formerly recognized, the most extreme penalties being not unfrequently imposed for the most trivial offences. When, however, under the increasing light of divine truth, the principles and requirements of justice became better understood, its administration was purged of many of the barbarous usages previously attending it. Since, then, in divine truth inheres the power to direct the human mind to something like proper conceptions of justice in the enactment and execution of those laws which govern men as communities, we are certainly bound to believe that in the dealings of God, the Author of truth, with the race will appear the very perfection of justice in all its parts. Do the Creator's dispensations to mankind, as recorded in sacred history, justify this faith? None, we think, will deny it. But still more, do they not confirm it? We affirm they do. Much might be adduced in proof of this, but one or two instances will fully suffice.

When God, by Moses, gave the Decalogue to the children of Israel, He said: "Thou shalt not kill." That was a clearly stated law. He afterward defined the penalty of its violation in the following explicit terms: "He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall be surely put to death." Again: "Thou shalt not steal."

. . . "If a man shall steal an ox, or a sheep, . . . he shall restore five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep." There is no ambiguity in any of this language; and it was understood by the people. They did *not* understand the death threatened them in the event of commission of murder to be any thing more or less than a literal deprivation of life. So with all the laws, general and special, which God has given to men. Unless the Edenic circumstance be an exception, He has never expressed an extreme penalty by the use of terms calculated to leave in the mind of the creature a doubt as to its nature. With this fact, then, in view, we are prepared to examine the Edenic law, and see whether the penalty of its violation was designated by the use of terms so equivocal and obscure as some assert.

The clearly announced penalty of the simple law given to Adam was, "*Thou shalt surely die.*" No person would for a single moment entertain the thought that any thing was here meant to be understood other than just what this language implies, did not a theory of man's nature demand it. The meaning of death, here, is, says Mr. George, "spiritual death," "conscious suffering." That he affirms to be the threatened penalty: and the "conscious suffering" he, of course, holds to be, in the case of the impenitent, *eternal.* There, dear reader, you have the theory of this profound thinker, with one of its beautiful features unveiled. Just look at it! God gave to Adam a law expressed in plainest literal terms. He desired, of course —to suppose otherwise would be to charge Him with wilful deception—to state the penalty also, which was unending existence in suffering, in equally compre-

hensive, unmistakable language. That, therefore, His creature Adam might not misapprehend it, but should know it *perfectly* to be eternal suffering, He said, "Thou shalt surely die."

What mind of any thing like ordinary intelligence does not revolt at the simple thought? Into just such surpassing folly does the theory of inherent immortality lead; just such untoward deception does it impute to an infinite, all-wise, loving Father; and *all* because considered indispensable to the preservation of a dogma. A doctrine which is so much a libel upon the character of God, and the existence of which demands of its votaries such wallowing in the mire of such extreme absurdities may be thought a proper one to be cherished by all predetermined to its defence, but it will always immediately cease to be so estimated by as many as become more properly learned, as we believe, in the school of Christ. The tendency of belief in natural immortality to so far blunt and divert men's moral and intellectual perceptions of divine government as to render the occupation and defence of such positions even possible, is of itself overwhelmingly condemnatory of the theory.

Profound John Foster, essayist, and clergyman in a Baptist church, asks the important question, "May we not think that if so *transcendently dreadful* a doctrine had been meant to be taught, there would have been such forms of proposition, of circumlocution, if necessary, as would have rendered all doubt or question a mere palpable absurdity?" To this there can be but one reply. Every enlightened and honest heart must respond in unqualified affirmation. To do otherwise is to charge

God with being less, far less than He so positively declares Himself to be. Dr. John Locke, the philosopher, wrote concerning the text under consideration: "It seems a strange way of understanding a law which requires the plainest and most direct words, that by *death* should be meant eternal life in misery." Strange indeed is it beyond expression. The theory that requires an exposition so much at war with every principle of justice and sound sense, such wresting of the Scriptures to steady its tottering form is assuredly based upon a false foundation, and contains within itself the elements of its utter destruction.

Upon the supposition that by "death," mentioned in connection with the Edenic law, was meant something totally unlike that which the simple term imports, the question arises, would Adam, without being fully informed concerning that unnatural and peculiar meaning, understand it in any other than its literal sense? There cannot be two opinions: all will agree that he would not. Well, does it appear that any such information was given him? It does not, and to maintain that he was so informed is to assert what not only cannot be proved, but also what must be esteemed an unwarranted assumption, since the record is silent on the point. That both our first parents understood the penalty to be literal death, deprivation of life, the circumstances attending the act of disobedience abundantly show. Mr. G. will find few indeed, even among advocates of inherent immortality, to agree with him that spiritual death, a condition of "conscious suffering," of "wretchedness and sin," was the penalty threatened.

Dr. Lange, writing upon the words of the serpent "For God doth know that in the day," etc., says: "The imitation of the divine language contains a species of mockery. Your eyes, says the voice of the tempter, instead of *closing in death*, will be, for the first time, truly opened." What a resemblance is there between the serpent's language as paraphrased by the Dr., and the sentiment pronounced from many pulpits in the present time! Dr. Adam Clarke says of the words: "Ye shall not surely die:" "The tempter insinuates the impossibility of her dying, as if he had said, 'God has created thee *immortal;* thy death, therefore, is impossible; and God knows this.'" The undying soul is the real man, says popular theology, and as that is immortal its "death is impossible." How like what Dr. Clarke imputes to the serpent!

The author of the work under notice chafes under the pressure of the stubborn fact that his position respecting the nature of man, and that literal death was not the penalty of sin, so exactly corresponds with the words of the serpent, and he finally endeavors to show there is some agreement between our position and the serpent's lie. This, however, as few of his readers will fail to see, is a sort of forlorn hope, a desperate attempt to turn attention in another direction. Eve, until her unfortunate intercourse with the tempter, believed that eating of the forbidden fruit would result in her death, literal death, of course. She informed the wily tempter that God had said so. This was met by the assertion, "ye shall not surely die;" and it was added, "God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened." The first assertion is in perfect harmony with the theory

we combat. It says, "our first parents *did* 'not surely die.'" The condition into which it is claimed the guilty pair were by transgression plunged, is by no means altogether unlike that which the serpent declared they should experience.

Nothing can well be more clear than that the *death* threatened as a penalty of violation of the Edenic law was a literal one, deprivation of life, extinction of the conscious being which God had so recently given them This is incontestably shown by the sentence pronounced upon Adam: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till *thou* return unto the ground; for out of it wast *thou* taken: for dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return." On page 63, Mr. George says: "Who believes that corpses are men? They are only the remains of men." The *man*, then, the *person* does not die at all. If this were true, how wrong was God, how right the serpent! Christ and others, too, must have done the serpent great injustice in saying he lied, since Mr. G. has shown so conclusively that he told the truth. But then they of course erred ignorantly, for the wise men of modern times were not there to instruct them. According to Mr. George, God committed a great blunder in saying, "dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return, for the *man*, the *thou* was *not* dust, did *not* die, was *not* taken from the ground, neither returned unto it. But more upon this point hereafter. All the circumstances connected with the giving of the Edenic law, and the announcement of the sentence combine to prove that the penalty was *literal death.*

The system of offerings and sacrifices under the Mosaic dispensation presents an unanswerable argument against

the theory that spiritual death, conscious suffering, is the penalty of sin. Paul says, "And almost all things are by the law" (Mosaic law) purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission."—Heb ix. 22. The life is declared to be in the blood, and when that is shed death results. "But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat."—Gen. ix. 4. It was the death of the sacrifice that satisfied, for the time being, and procured remission. Death, then, deprivation of life, was what violated law required: it was the wages of sin. In harmony with this Paul declared: "The wages of sin is death."—Rom. vi. 23. The question as to the nature of this death, this penalty of sin, is further settled by the character of the sin-offerings which effected the "remission" under the law.

With Israel the "tenth day" of the "seventh month" was set apart as the day of yearly sacrifice of atonement. "For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that you may be clean from all your sins before the Lord."—Lev. xvi. 30. Again: "This shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year."—ver. 34. What was it the blood, or life of which was accepted in the place of that of the sinner? "And Aaron shall bring the bullock of the sin-offering, which is for himself, and shall make an atonement for himself, and for his house, and shall *kill* the bullock of the sin-offering." . . . "Then shall he *kill* the goat of the sin-offering, that is for the people."—Lev. xvi. 11 and 15. All this means *death*, and there is no conscious suffering anywhere hinted at. Such an idea is nowhere recognized, because it forms no part of God's

plan, it having sprung up by human invention, many centuries after the giving of the law. Suffering exists, of course, in consequence of sin and in connection with the infliction of the penalty, but it is incidental merely, and forms no part of the penalty proper.

"For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul."—Lev. xvii. 11. Here we have it again distinctly stated that the "life is in the blood;" and also that *it* was given "to make an atonement." But this text, says one, teaches that men have souls. Yes, in much the same manner that all other texts so confidently relied on teach it. He must be dull indeed who cannot see at a glance that *souls* in the text are the children of Israel themselves. If any do not see it upon reading the verse, they cannot fail to do so upon reading the following one. "Therefore I said unto the children of Israel, No soul of *you* shall eat blood, neither shall any *stranger* that sojourneth among you eat blood." Theological souls are not supposed to be so fond of eating as to require the restraint of a divine prohibition.

Some objector will say, "It is true the blood is the life of the lower animals, but the soul is the life of man, and when that departs death ensues." But hear the word of God! He commanded the children of Israel not to eat the blood, for "it is the life of *all* flesh."

In all the threatenings of evil which God denounced against ancient Israel in case of disobedience, there was nothing worse than calamities of various character, including death. Upon the supposition that

God intended to inflict upon them, in case of continued disobedience, untold sufferings during all the endlessness of eternity, how can we account for the fact that He gave them no intimation whatever of it? If, as Mr. George contends, the doctrine of eternal suffering is so salutary in its effects upon hardened sinners and upon society in general that it not only exerts an incomparably great restraining influence upon the ungodly, but induces faithfulness also, why did not God proclaim it to the people? To put these questions is to answer them. Assuming the doctrine to be true, was God ignorant of the wonderful results that mere knowledge of it would effect in turning sinners from their evil ways? How much wiser than God are some latter-day theologians! The absence in all God's threatenings toward His people of old, and in His denunciations against them, of any reference to a condition of suffering after death is more than suggestive, it may almost be considered as *proof* that the doctrine has no foundation in truth, but is a mere human invention. This we affirm it to be, and no amount of reasoning, true or false, can ever prove it otherwise, for it has no place in the word of God.

But let us return and pursue still further our examinations concerning the nature of the death announced as the penalty of sin. The sacrifices under the law were a shadow of that which was to come. The offering of them secured to participants a passing over or transmission of their sins from year to year until God should offer a perfect sacrifice, a lamb without blemish for sins for all time; as it is written of Christ, "after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat

down on the right hand of God." Thus Christ was the perfect sacrifice; and in order to make a complete and lasting atonement he certainly suffered the penalty, whatever it is. Peter declares, "Christ also suffered for us." What did Christ suffer? Was it spiritual death? Mr. G. must contend that Christ did die a spiritual death, since he maintains that *it* is the penalty of the law, the penalty "Adam suffered immediately in the day he sinned."—p. 30.

What is this spiritual death? Mr. G. defines it thus: "It is a condition of sin and wretchedness:" it is to "lose the life of God."—p. 189. Christ, then, according to this author's theory, lost "the *life of God*," falling into "a condition of sin and wretchedness;" he became "alienated *from the life of God*" (the italics are his). Mr. George doubtless holds in common with the generality of, so-called, orthodoxists that Christ is God, that he is a part of the Deity. Did one part of God lose the life of the other part? Or did God lose his own life? Is God Himself divisible? Then the theological soul is greater than God, for that is held to be *indivisible*. Is the Creator of heaven and earth capable of being plunged into "a condition of sin and wretchedness?" Mr. George quotes very approvingly from Mr. Landis' work, entitled THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, AND FINAL CONDITION OF THE WICKED. We will also quote from that work, and Mr. G. will, if consistent, recognize his own position in that of Mr. Landis though, perhaps, stated more clearly than may be thought altogether desirable. On page 259, he says:

"In the sense of the penalty of the Divine law, death is the displeasure of God, and the soul that suffers that

penalty is cut off from the source of spiritual life and happiness, a breaking up of all harmony between God and the creature."

The reader will notice a striking similarity between the views of Messrs. Landis and George, respecting the penalty of sin. They substantially agree. On p. 262, of Mr. Landis' work, it is written, "our blessed Redeemer suffered the penalty of the law for his people." There, reader, you have it in all the strength and consistency and beauty it can command. How do you like the looks of it? Christ spiritually dead! Our Redeemer in "a condition of sin and wretchedness!" Christ "*cut off* from the source of spiritual life and happiness!" Unto such blasphemy does the doctrine which makes spiritual death the penalty of sin inevitably lead. In the "gross darkness" of such worse than absurdities will men grope in order to save a theory. These blasphemies are legitimate conclusions of the immortal soul theory. And this doctrine that, in this age of freedom of thought and action is deluging christendom with infidelity, the world is asked to believe. They who can so far cast off the shackles of prejudice as to search for themselves the word of God, will reject it as mischievous beyond measure, while very many, many will continue to think the Bible teaches it in its various parts, and so will reject both it and the Bible as equally unworthy of confidence, and will reject Christ as well. Look carefully over the history of the doctrine since the third and fourth centuries of the Christian era, when it began to gain much strength in the church, and note how very few are the evils and monstrous abominations of which it has not been

Well, then, since Christ did not die a "spiritual death," did he suffer eternal torment? No one will be so mad as to claim that he did; and yet they should claim it, if that is the penalty, or else admit that there has been no atonement made. Christ *did* suffer death, literal death. His sacrifice was in harmony with its types, the sacrifices under the law. It was the shedding of blood, which is the life. He said, "This is my *blood* of the New Testament, which is *shed* for many."—Mark xiv. 24. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ *died* for us. Much more, then, being now justified by his *blood*."—Rom. v. 8, 9. "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things. . . . But with the precious *blood of Christ*, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."—1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

Says Paul, "The wages of sin is death."—Rom. vi. 23. The Greek term for *death*, in this passage, is the same as in the following: "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he, by the grace of God should taste *death* for every man."—Heb. ii. 9. Are we to believe that "by the grace of God" Christ "lost the *life of God*," suffered "*sin and wretchedness*" for every man? "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's *death* till he come."—1 Cor. xi. 26. Here, too, we have the same Greek term. Did the Corinthian brethren, whenever they ate of the bread and drank of the cup show forth the Lord's "sin and wretchedness," his "alienation from the *life of God*" till he come? Of Simeon it is said, "and it was revealed unto him by the

Holy Ghost, that he should not see *death* before he had seen the Lord's Christ."—Luke ii. 26. We have here, again, the same word. Good old Simeon would hardly have been pleased with the assurance from the Holy Ghost that he should not have "sin and wretchedness," be "alienated *from the life of God*" till he had seen Christ. He could not reasonably have been expected to be anxious to behold the Prince of Peace. Had he, having seen the Saviour, contemplated such a sad experience we would never have heard of his exclaiming, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word."

Paul declared: "Christ *died* for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried." Will Mr. George; will Mr. Landis; will *any* of the, so-called, orthodox theologists dare openly say he did not? And yet they practically deny it. Dead persons are not *men*, says Mr. G., "they are only the *remains* of men." Then it was no part of Christ that died; what went into the grave was only the *remains* of Christ. If this be true then we are *all in our sins*, and the sufferings of Christ were vain. O what lamentable folly! "I am he," said the glorified Redeemer, "that liveth, and was *dead*."

We have shown that the penalty named in the Edenic law was not understood, and could not, under the circumstances, have been understood in any other than its literal sense. We have shown, too, that the penalty mentioned in connection with the Sinaitic law was literal death, and that it was so understood. We have further shown that the system of offerings and sacrifices under the Mosaic economy, requiring, as it

did, the shedding of the blood of the victim, its deprivation of life, was an unquestionable recognition of what we maintain is the fact, that literal death is the penalty of sin. And lastly, we have shown also that Christ, in the yielding up of his life, in the shedding of his blood unto death as an "atonement," as an offering of "one sacrifice for sins forever," suffered that penalty and that only. We are, therefore, absolutely shut up to the conclusion that *literal death* is the penalty of sin. Other evils are, of course, sometimes suffered but they are, as we have remarked, merely incidental, or, as has sometimes been the case, denounced as special judgments upon nations, communities, or individuals.

Death was so explicitly stated in the beginning to be the penalty of sin, and has been so positively reiterated at various times by inspiration, nothing less than the most cogent, resistless reasons for attaching to the term an unnatural meaning can be reasonably held to justify its being done. Are there such considerations urged? There is not so much as one not either based upon or suggested by the assumption of natural or inherent immortality. That which is, perhaps, the least so, and is largely dwelt upon by Mr. George, is the fact that our first parents did not die a physical death the day they sinned.

This objection must, in view both of the circumstances and the record, be esteemed pitifully incompetent. Those theologists who so strenuously urge it can scarcely be unaware that the marginal reading contains the true rendering of the words which express the penalty. That rendering is, "dying thou shalt die." We are, as suggested, quite willing to allow that Dr.

Adam Clarke knew something of both Hebrew and Greek, and we doubt not our "Rev." brother will regard him as pretty reliable authority on this text. Of the words "dying thou shalt die," he says —"*muth tamuth*, literally . . . *dying thou shalt die.* From that moment thou shalt become mortal, and shalt continue in a *dying state* till thou *die.* This we find literally accomplished: every moment of his life, man may be considered as dying . . . Other meanings have been given to this passage, but they are in general either fanciful or incorrect." Of the expression, "dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," the same commentator says:

"God had said that in the day they ate of the forbidden fruit, *dying they should die:* they should then become *mortal.* . . . The tree of life, as we have already seen, was intended to be the means of continual preservation. For as no being but God can exist independently of any supporting agency, so man could not have continued to live without a particular supporting agent; and this supporting agent, under God, appears to have been the tree of life."

On page 27, Mr. George says:—"Those who are but slightly acquainted with the Hebrew idiom very well know that our version" (shalt surely die) "conveys precisely the meaning of the original." We certainly have no objection whatever to the reading of the text: it is quite satisfactory to us. But when it is urged that the language means something entirely different from what God manifestly designed in the use of it, we show that what not only competent authorities affirm, but also what the Bible itself marginally indicates to be

a more perfect rendering, positively forbids the interpretation insisted upon. He will not deny Dr. Clarke some slight acquaintance "with the Hebrew idiom," hence we, for the present, at least, leave him to settle matters with the Dr.; and as they are of the same school, an amicable adjustment, in which due reverence to acknowledged learning and ability will be shown, should not be thought impossible. The Dr., like many others, greatly erred in supposing that Adam was created immortal, but became mortal by transgression. Had man been *created immortal* the possibility of death would have been precluded. Holding the immortal soul theory, and yet admitting that the penalty was literal death, the Dr. overlooked the fact that as the penalty was executed upon the body, the fancied soul, the really guilty party went free.

Bishop Law, speaking on Heb. ii. 14, 15, says:

"It will be necessary to attend to the true meaning of the word *Death*, as it is strictly and properly applied in Scripture; and this may be best seen by looking back to the remarkable passage where it is first used, in that denunciation which brought Adam and his posterity under it; and where we must suppose it used in all the plainness and propriety of speech imaginable. And, accordingly, we find the original here, as full and emphatical as words can make it. They are translated—Thou shalt *surely*—but might with more strictness have been rendered—Thou shalt *utterly die;* which one would think sufficiently explained in the sentence passed on our first parents, where they are reminded of their original, and of that state to which this change should reduce them. 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken; dust thou art, and unto dust

shalt thou return.' Now what do we imagine they could possibly understand by this denunciation but a resumption of that natural life or conscious being, which their Creator had been lately pleased to bestow upon them? the forfeiting which must include a total loss of all those benefits that then did, or ever could proceed from him? This surely, and nothing less, must be implied in that most solemn sentence; nor can we well conceive the unhappy subjects of it to have been at that time so very ingenious as to explain it away by distinguishing upon the several component parts of their constitution, and concluding, that by death no more was intended than only a separation of these parts, while the principle of them was still living in some different manner, or that it was a continuation of their consciousness and real existence, though in some other place. No, *this was the philosophy of after ages;* concerning which, all I shall say at present is, that some of its most eminent patrons cannot help observing, that they 'do not find it in the Scriptures.' [Tillotson, vol. ii. Ser. 100.] These, in their obvious meaning, represent the *whole* man, individual, person, or being, as included in the sentence addressed to him; nor do they seem to take notice of any other circumstance in the case, beside that, so often mentioned, of his returning to the 'dust or ground from whence he was taken;' and might not the first pair as well expect, that the same 'breath of life, which the Lord God had breathed into his nostrils, whereby man became a living soul,' should still survive the execution of that sentence, or that the dust itself should praise God; as that any kind of knowledge of, or communication with him, should continue in that state of darkness and destruction to which they were then doomed?"

Dr. Lange says concerning the penalty:—"Dying, death, the sense of these words he can only anticipate,

according as their contrast with the sense of the tree of life grows more clear. At the moment of the fall began the death of man. Death waxes stronger with us until it outgrows life, and conquers it." Thus we see they who hold to the unity of man's nature, are not the only ones who demand a literal interpretation of the term which expresses the "penalty of sin."

Few of the more thoughtful theologistic members of the, so-called, orthodox school have been so unwary as to fall squarely into the peculiarly illogical and unscriptural position boldly assumed by Mr. George. We have already stated, as will be remembered, that on page 63 he says: "Who believes that corpses are men? They are only the remains of men." This is certainly wandering just as far from the truth in this matter as he could possibly get. The Bible position is that the man is a soul; while Mr. G. holds that the soul is a man. These positions would not of necessity differ widely were there held by him to be only *one* entity represented in the living being called man: but as he contends there are *two*, the positions are antipodal. The soul, says he, is the *man;* the organization which we see is, when the soul leaves it, only the *remains* of a man. This statement possesses the merit of tangibleness and simplicity. When, then, it is said, "The Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground," it is meant that He formed out of the dust an "immaterial," "uncompounded," "indivisible" something —though how it could thus be something is an unsolvable mystery—called an *immortal soul*, breathed into the nostrils of this immortal soul the breath of life; and the immortal soul became a living soul. If any

thing about this is seen to be most grotesquely absurd, the responsibility will, of course, be placed where it belongs, upon the theory. Frivolous and meaningless as these conclusions are, they are nevertheless not only legitimate but unavoidable.

Then, again, the language, "dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," must have been addressed to the immortal soul, that being the man. What, then, upon this writer's theory, becomes of the undying soul? Affirming *it* to be the *man*, and not denying that the *man* was formed "of the dust of the ground," Mr. George is the very last one in all the world to make use of the term "materialist," with reference to others, since his position involves him inextricably in an extremely inconsistent, unreasonable, and unscriptural form of materialism. What could be more illogical and unscriptural, for instance, than to make, as his position compels him to do, the sentence of dissolution, extinction of conscious being to apply to the very object which he contends is absolutely incapable of dissolution?

Charity requires of us the assumption that the assertor of this fallacious proposition failed to fairly weigh it. Did not charity thus require, we would, in consequence of some strong indications in that direction, be under the necessity of concluding that he regarded it the very best way of escape from a certain difficulty, and staked the chances of success upon a possibility that it would escape critical notice. But this thought, as we have intimated, we cannot entertain. He will not forget it was the *man* that was condemned to return unto the ground, from whence he was taken.

And then, too, he will be under the necessity of

harmonizing his singular position with the fact that what he is pleased to denominate the *remains* of a man was, in the case of Adam, called man *before* that by which he became a living, conscious being was added. These are strange difficulties for a thinking man to fall into, but we know of only one way of escape, and that is to back squarely and gracefully out, and forsake the delusive theory that leads to them. Should he think to get out of the difficulties by concluding it was what would finally be the *remains* of a man, or the tenement which the man inhabited, that was "formed of the dust of the ground," while the *man*, being a living soul, came from God, he will have a matter to adjust with Paul, who says of this same *man*, Adam, who *became* a living soul, that he was "of the earth, earthy." He will thus conflict, too, with God's account of the creation, for that expressly affirms *man* was made of the dust; and it also says of the lower animals that they are living souls.

A doctrine that requires of its patrons such ludicrous exhibitions of inconsistency can lay no just or reasonable claim to divine origin. It is a human invention, and human wisdom is wholly unable to clothe it in garments that will prevent the piercing light of truth from entering and revealing its repulsive form.

When Adam had sinned, God placed a "flaming sword" to keep the way of "the tree of life," lest Adam should "put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever." As the man proper is held to have been immortal and, therefore, could not die, the expression *live forever* could not have had reference to a continuance of living existence, for

that he would have whether he ate of the fruit of the tree of life or not; but it must, according to the theory we are considering, have had reference to the opposite of the death Adam died, which is held to have been a spiritual one. But is there a man to be found who would be willing to affirm, or even seriously assume that the Edenic tree of life possessed the quality of imparting spiritual life? We think not. No thoughtful person can fail to see the utter absurdity of the theory that the threatened penalty was spiritual death. At every turn it does gross violence to the most palpable principles of exegesis, of reason and sound sense.

The simple truth is, Adam was created, placed in the garden, and surrounded with everything calculated to promote his happiness. A law was given him consisting of this simple commandment: "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," or "dying thou shalt die." Man, in common with all the creatures that were made, was created an animal or mortal being, but a candidate for immortality, and was granted access to the tree of life, by eating of the fruit of which, his life would be preserved until such time as God—provided Adam kept the law, should choose to confer upon him an immortal or spiritual existence. But obeying the lusts of the carnal or fleshly mind, which "is not subject to the law of God," he transgressed the law, and the penalty, "dying thou shalt die," was inflicted by depriving him of the right to partake of the tree of life. Thus left to himself, nature, as Drs. Clarke and Lange rightly claim, weakened and faded

until, at last, he died; and then transpired the last threatened consequence of his transgression, "dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

Adam's condition after being driven from the garden, is the condition of all his posterity, except the Second Adam, Jesus Christ. They come into the world possessing no nature or principle of life other than that of animal; and if, by refusing the offers of mercy, and doing despite to the spirit of grace, which God gives to abide in them, and which will, if obedience is yielded to it, enable them to develop a character in harmony with Him, they fail to become possessed of any higher life principle, they pass through life into death; a death so irrevocable that if the redemption scheme had been rendered incomplete by the non-resurrection of Jesus, even them, as Paul emphatically declared, who have "fallen asleep in Christ" would have *perished.* How very simple and reasonable is this. The truth is quite apt to be plain and simple, but error is always found to be unwieldly and hard to manage.

"Ye shall *not* surely die," said the serpent, to Eve. "Ye shall *not* surely die," say our author and other immortal-soulists. "Thou *shalt* surely die," said the Lord our God, and we are firm in the faith that it is altogether safe and wise and right to believe Him. We hold that few facts are more evident than that *death,* extinction of conscious being, as the penalty of sin, is the uniform testimony of inspiration throughout the Bible. The men who preach otherwise, who teach that the *man* cannot thus die, do, ignorantly and unmeaningly, no doubt, resist the truth, give currency to the serpent's falsehood, overturn the very foundations

of Christianity, and perform a mighty work in recruiting the ranks of infidelity. To such we humbly say, seek, by earnest studiousness and prayer, to overcome prejudice, to *know* the reasonable truths which God asks His reasonable creatures to accept, and so no longer charge Him with demanding an acceptance of what is itself wholly unreasonable, and expressed, were it true, in altogether unreasonable terms.

CHAPTER II.

"CANNOT KILL THE SOUL."

We now proceed to examine the *one* passage which the author of the work under notice relies on to prove the doctrine of inherent immortality, and also the very few prominent passages which he believes support his exposition of the one. That we may not be misapprehended in any of our observations, we remark, in the language of Mr. Read, BIBLE *vs.* TRADITION, that the Bible "meaning of soul is, a creature that lives by breathing; and as the essential endowment of such a creature is life, so life will stand often as a correct meaning of soul. When soul is applied to man, it may be translated *life, soul, man, you, yourself, person, myself, thyself*, etc., according to the text."

Nephesh is the Hebrew term generally translated *soul.* It occurs about seven hundred times, and is rendered *soul* four hundred and seventy-one times; *life* and *living*, about one hundred and fifty; and is also rendered a *man*, a *person, self, they, me, him, any* one, *breath*, heart, *mind, appetite*, the *body* (dead, as well as alive,)

etc. It is also twenty-eight times applied to beasts, and to every *creeping thing*. The Greek term corresponding to the Hebrew *nephesh*, is *psuche*. It occurs one hundred and five times, and is translated *soul* fifty-nine times, and *life* forty times. It is also, like *nephesh*, otherwise variously translated, twice being applied to beasts. The foregoing renderings of the Hebrew and Greek terms mentioned, are given on the authority of BIBLE *vs.* TRADITION, an excellent work.

Dr. Parkhurst says:—"*Nephesh*, as a noun, hath been supposed to signify the spiritual part of man, or what we commonly call the soul. I must confess I can find no passage where it hath undoubtedly this meaning." What do our present-day theologues say to that? The term which is four hundred and seventy-one times, in our English version, represented by a word, the very use of which is believed to confirm the view that man is possessed of a spiritual entity capable of separate conscious existence, cannot be found by a learned writer to have that meaning in any instance.

The one passage, upon his explication of which Mr. George stations himself, and strives to make everything bend to it, is Matt. x. 28:

"And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

The corresponding passage in Luke reads:

"And I say unto you my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed hath

power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him." —Luke xii. 4, 5.

We are quite willing to admit that there is no passage in the Bible more difficult to explain to the satisfaction of believers in the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, than the one first quoted above. But let it be borne in mind, that the *seeming* sentiment of no one, two or three passages of Scripture may safely or wisely be held to teach what the very many others manifestly, nay, undeniably discountenance and oppose, and especially when the few are susceptible of a reasonable exposition in harmony with the manifest sentiment of the many. The ignoring of this just principle has produced lamentable results: its fruits are evil, and only evil. That this passage *is* susceptible not only of an explication in entire harmony with the multitude that oppose what it is by many supposed to teach, but one which is more reasonable also than that given it by theologists generally, we design to sufficiently show.

Whatever teaching may be credited to the passage, it cannot consistently be held to teach the immortality or indestructibility of any thing connected with man by nature. The very opposite is true of the text, for the exhortation is, "fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but fear him which *is able* to *destroy* both in hell. Whatever *soul*, here, means, the fact is expressed that, though men cannot kill or destroy it, God *can*. Since, then, this text unquestionably teaches that God can kill the *soul*, whatever is here meant by the term, the question arises, will He under any circumstances do so? The language of Jesus certainly implies that God is not only able to do

it, but that He will do it. To the question there can be but one reply. Scripture testimony is too plain to admit of doubt. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." "Oh," says the objector, "this is spiritual death." Far from it. The verb *shall*, in the text, makes the death threatened to the sinning soul an event future to the act of sin, whereas the act of transgression, and the introduction of what is denominated spiritual death must of necessity happen cotemporaneously.

Latter-day theologians contend that the soul is immortal, indestructible. If this were so then God Himself could not destroy it any more than could man. To meet this objection, it is asserted that *destroy* has not in this text its usual signification, but is used tropically. Is it so? Then how may we know that *kill*, *soul*, *body*, *fear* are not also thus used? To urge that these terms are here used in a figurative sense would be to insist that the text teaches nothing: and yet it would be no more unreasonable to affirm *they* are used tropically than it is to so affirm of *destroy*. It should have been frankly said, "the term *destroy* cannot just here bear its usual signification without doing great violence to our theory." Of course it cannot. Give it just as literal an interpretation as is claimed for every other word in the text, and it will do for the popular theory what Jesus affirmed men can only do to the creature, viz., *kill* it.

Pursuing the assumption that *destroy* was used by Jesus, in this instance, figuratively, the idea being that one can render soul and body utterly miserable in the theological hell, some commentators and others have taken the position that satan is the "him" referred to

as able to do this. In this they are consistent. They do not charge God with rendering beings miserable in hell: no, they have it that He at the judgment consigns them to that abode, and "his satanic majesty" does the rest. Those portions of God's word, however, which testify to the final destruction of both hell and devil, are not in high favor with any of these eternal tormentists. Among those who have taken the position just mentioned, and have finally concluded it was satan that was said to be able to destroy soul and body, are Drs. Lange, Stier and others. Dr. Lange, however, subsequently changed his mind, and openly so avowed.

Our Saviour was speaking to his disciples, his "friends." He exhorted them to faithfulness in proclaiming the truth, under all circumstances, not permitting any fear of bodily injury to interfere with or prevent the prosecution of the work assigned them. He adds:

"Fear not them who *apokteinonton*, murder (in the sense of cutting to pieces) the *soma*, body, but cannot *apokteinai*, kill, (in the sense of utterly destroy) the *psuche*, soul or being; but rather fear him who is able *apolesai*, to destroy both (*psuche* and *soma*) body and being, in Gehenna. The meaning undoubtedly is, that wicked men can only destroy the present being of the righteous, and that God could raise them up again; but if they apostatized to save their present lives, that God was able—which implies that He would do it—to destroy their entire being in Gehenna."—*Bible vs. Tradition.*

Jesus had said to them—"Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on."—Matt. vi. 25.

The word here rendered life is the same (*psuche*) that is rendered *soul* in x. 28. What determined the rendering of it *life* in the one case, and *soul* in the other? Would it have been done had there been no soul-entity theory to serve? The reader cannot fail to perceive the true state of the case. Again: Christ said to the disciples, "He that findeth his life, (*psuche*) shall lose it: and he that loseth his life (*psuche*) for my sake shall find it."—x. 39. Here is much the same sentiment expressed as in x. 28.

Yet again: "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it. For what is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"—Matt. xvi. 25, 26. Dr. Adam Clarke here remarks that he knows not on what authority many have translated the Greek term *life* in verse 25, and *soul* in verse 26: "but," says he, "I am certain it means life in both places." Since the translators desired to have it *soul* in the last verse, why did they not so render it in the first? The reason is obvious. They did not like the looks of a text which would express the possibility of a man losing his *soul* for Christ's sake. Had they put it life in both verses the reading would have been consistent and sensible throughout; for what *would* it profit any man, if he should gain the whole world and lose his *life?* or what would a man give in exchange for his *life?* However the terms are rendered they make sad havoc with Mr. George's theory. He says the soul is the *man*, consequently the text as it stands represents the possibility of a soul losing its soul; and if a soul possesses a soul, why may not the soul possessed possess a soul, and so

on *ad infinitum*. On the other hand, if *life* be put in place of soul, as Clarke insists, then the difficulty is increased, for his *real man*, being immortal, can only die a "spiritual death," and Christ is thus made to urge his disciples to a willingness to "lose the life of God," to enter a "condition of sin and wretchedness" for his sake. What a wretched theory that must be which is ever floating upon the surface of such absurdities. It is lamentable indeed that rational men are willing to grope about in that kind of darkness.

A fact which we feel confident will not be denied by any well-informed person is, that the righteous are in the New Testament said to have a life which the unrighteous are not said to have. In recognition of this the term "sleep" is frequently used with reference to the righteous dead, but it is never used with reference to the wicked dead. Understand, we speak of the New Testament. Says Dr. Lange—"The designation 'sleep' is used in the New Testament to denote the death of believers only."

Another fact is that believers obtain through Jesus the principle of the resurrection. This is fully conceded by some orthodox commentators. Paul remarked: "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you."—Rom. viii. 11. The marginal reading for "by," in the text, is *because of:* and this reading is so well supported by MSS., that best critics adopt it, among them the translators of the AMERICAN BIBLE UNION. Dr. Hodge says of it—"The meaning is that the indwelling of God's Spirit is the

ground or reason why believers are not left in the grave." The mind cannot conceive just how the indwelling of God's Spirit is the *ground* or *reason* why believers are not left in death, nor just what is that life in recognition of the existence of which the righteous dead are said, by New Testament writers, to "sleep," but we do know, because inspiration informs us, that the result, the effect is resurrection from the dead. We conceive it to be precisely this kind of *life* or *being* which is meant in Matt. x. 28.

When Christ said, "whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it" (life), he had reference, as none will deny, to two *kinds* of life. Enemies of Christ are able to kill the natural life of believers, but that which shall be *found* is a spiritual life which they shall receive by being raised "up at the last day." Of course Christ's people do not have that life in its reality while the natural life is possessed, but they do have it as a seed or life-principle, and although *they* may be killed and given to the burning flame *it* will still exist and God will give them a life, by a resurrection from the dead, in full and glorious reality *because* of its existence. Therefore, believers should not fear them which kill the *soma*, body, take away its life, but are not able to kill the *psuche*, life, which they possess by virtue of a living union with Christ: but they should rather fear him who is able and will be likely, should they forsake Christ and the gospel to save their present or natural life, to *destroy both*, giving them no resurrection from the dead. Says Luke, xii. 4, 5: "Be not afraid of them that kill the body," (destroy the natural life) "and after that have no more that they can do.

But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell," (*gehenna,*) where he will destroy you utterly.

Harwood renders Matt. x. 28, "Fear not those who can inflict upon you bodily pain and torture, and deprive you of a precarious being—but whose power extends no further. But let that great Being be the object of your fear, who can involve both soul and body in total and everlasting destruction. Let that great Being, I repeat it, be the object of your constant fear."

"Every reasonable person must perceive that *psuche* means a person's self. The learned know that Matthew—who probably wrote his gospel in Hebrew, *uses a great many Hebrew idioms.* Thus we find that Luke often explains Matthew. It was customary for the Hebrews to use the expressions, my soul, your soul, instead of the reflective pronouns, myself, yourself, etc." —*Bible vs. Tradition.*

It is evident that *all* the gospel writers understood a man's soul to be himself, not a fancied something within him capable of being separated from him. Not only is this so, but it cannot be proved that *any* member of the Christian church believed otherwise for at least the first hundred years—it would be safe to name a longer period—of its existence. The popular theory of man's nature was introduced into the church at a much later period, as will in due time be shown.

"Gr., fear not from those *apokteinonton to soma,* but the *psuche* not being able *apokteinai;* but fear rather that (him that) being able *kai,* both, the *psuche kai,* and, the *soma apolesai en geenne.* The verb apokteino, of which *apokteinonton* is the participle, and *apok-*

teinai the infinitive, is defined by the Hederici Lexicon, interficio, defined by Ainsworth, to kill, put to death, destroy, consume, *occido,* defined by Ainsworth, to be extinguished, to die, to be slain, to perish, to be lost, to be wasted, and *perino,* defined by Ainsworth, to take away wholly, destroy, ruin, deface, to kill, slay. . . . *Apollumi,* of which *apolesai* (the other verb used in the verse,) is the infinitive, is defined by the Hederici Lex., *perdo, vasto, pereo, disperdo,* to abolish, to waste, to cause to be lost, to perish, to be annihilated: the reader has already had the meaning of the last three of these verbs. . . . The reader perceives, that *apolesai,* applied in the verse to *both* the *psuche* and the *soma,* is a much stronger word to express utter extinction than the verb *apokteino,* applied in the verse to *soma.* If among the definitions of apokteino, we take *kill,* then the Greek of Matt. x. 28 will be, . . . fear not from those killing the *soma,* (*i. e.,* the living person, for the body without *psuche,* breath, life, cannot be killed,) but the *psuche,* breath, life, (*psuche* is here used *kat exochen,* by way of eminence, for breath, life, from the dead) not being able to kill; but fear rather that (him that) being able both the *psuche* and the *soma* (*i. e.,* the entire being) to abolish, waste, destroy totally, cause to be lost, to perish, be annihilated in *geenna.*"—*Theology of the Bible.*

All will surely perceive, we think, that the *psuche,* (rendered soul) life, which Jesus affirmed men cannot kill, is something peculiar to the believer, and possessors of it are warned against disobedience, or in any way whatever seeking to save their natural life at the expense of the precious faith committed to them, lest, offending him who is able to *destroy* the *whole being,* they be not raised from the dead to everlasting life and glory. To deny the truth, knowing, or believing it to be

such, is to deny Christ, and he has said, "whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." To be renounced by Christ, is to have him neither for a mediator nor Saviour. To so apostatize as to be thus separated from Christ, the LIFE-GIVER, the "author of eternal life," the "resurrection and the life," is to be destroyed *utterly*. If a man sacrifice his life for God, it is not *lost*, for God will give him, the *man*, a future life in infinite glory.

That part of the text, Matt. x. 28, which, rightly understood, positively prohibits the interpretation insisted on by Mr. George and others, we have hitherto refrained from noticing. It is the expression, "in hell." The word rendered hell, is *gehenna*. It occurs twelve times in the received Greek text, and is translated *hell* in every place. It is not itself a Greek word, but is simply the Grecian method of spelling the Hebrew words which are translated "The Valley of Hinnom."

"Parkhurst considers that as the Septuagint translate, or rather spell in Greek letters, without translating *gee* or *gai*, a valley, and Hinnom, a man's name, in Job xviii. 16, by Gaihenna, so the Gehenna of the N. T. is in like manner a corruption of the same Hebrew words, *Gee*, a valley, and *Hinnom*, the person who was once the possessor of it. So we may consider the word as Hebrew with nothing of Greek about it, except the spelling. Our translators have no more authority for translating *gehenna* by *hell*, than they would have had for translating Sodom or Gomorrah, *hell*. All critics are agreed upon the origin of the word.

The valley of Hinnom was a delightful vale planted with trees, watered by fountains on the south-east of Jerusalem, by the torrent Kedron. Here the idolatrous

kings of Judah placed the brazen image of Moloch. The idolatrous Jews were accustomed to sacrifice, not only doves, rams, calves, and bulls, but often their own children. . . . The pious king Josiah caused it to be polluted, and made a place of desecration, of loathing, and horror. There were cast all kinds of filth, together with the carcasses of beasts, and the unburied criminals who had been executed. Continual fires were necessary, in order to consume these; and there worms were always feeding on the remaining relics."—*B. vs. T.*

The author of THEOLOGY OF THE BIBLE, after remarking upon the use of the word in the various versions, says:

"Our orthodox editors give in the margin a note to the E. V. words, the valley of Hinnom, in Josh. xv. 8, thus, 'Memorable for the worship of the idol Moloch with human sacrifice; and as having given occasion to the New Testament name for the place of future punishment, *Gehenna*.' Thus early in the Bible do our orthodox editors say to the readers of the note, that *Gehenna* in the New Testament is a name, and a name for orthodoxy's place of future punishment. But the Rheims version, and James' orthodox ecclesiastics, have not ventured once to use the word *Gehenna* in their version of the N. T. It was so plain that the Gr. geenna, Lat., *gehenna*, Ital., *geenna*, of the New Testament was the valley of Hinnom of the Old Testament, that they entirely avoided the word *gehenna*."

Let us further examine concerning gehenna, valley of Hinnom. What is its locality? In Josh, xv. 8, we find the situation of the lot of Judah described as follows: "And the border went up by the *valley of the son of Hinnom* unto the south side of the Jebusite; the same is Jerusalem: and the border went up to the

top of the mountain that lieth before the *valley of Hinnom* westward, which is at the end of the valley of the giants northward." In chap. xviii. 16, we find the inheritance of Benjamin described thus: "And the border came down to the end of the mountain that lieth before the *valley of the son of Hinnom*, and which is in the valley of the giants on the north, and descended to the *valley of Hinnom*, to the side of Jebusi on the south, and descended to En-rogel." In the word of the Lord commanding Jeremiah to warn his disobedient people of evil that should come upon them unless they repented, we find the following: "And go forth unto the *valley of the son of Hinnom*, which is by the entry of the east gate, and proclaim there the words that I shall tell thee."—Jer. xix. 2.

Is it true that this once beautiful valley became the scene of awful abominations? "Moreover, he" (Ahaz) "burnt incense in the *valley of the son of Hinnom*, and burnt his children in the fire, after the abominations of the heathen, whom the Lord had cast out before the children of Israel."—2 Chron. xxviii. 3. Also xxxiii. 6: "And he" (Manasseh) "caused his children to pass through the fire in the *valley of the son of Hinnom*." "And he" (Josiah) "defiled Topheth which is in the *valley of the children of Hinnom*, that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Moloch."—2 Kings xxiii. 10.

Kitto says of Hinnom: "When Josiah overthrew this idolatry, he defiled the valley by casting into it the bones of the dead, the greatest of all pollutions among the Hebrews; and from that time it became the common jakes of Jerusalem, into which all the refuse of

the city was cast, and where the combustible portions were consumed by fire." Prof. Stuart remarks concerning it: "The pious king Josiah, caused it to be polluted, *i. e.*, he caused to be carried there the filth of the city of Jerusalem . . . Perpetual fires were kept up in order to consume the offal which was deposited there, and as the same offal would breed worms, (for all putrifying meat of course does,) hence came the expression, 'where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.'"

This valley became a place of punishment. "For the children of Judah have done evil in my sight, saith the Lord: they have set their abominations in the house which is called by my name, to pollute it. And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the *valley of the son of Hinnom*, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but *the valley of slaughter;* for they shall bury in Tophet till there be no place."—Jer. vii. 30–32. In chap. xix. the above is substantially repeated; and it is added: "I will make void the counsel of Judah and Jerusalem in this place; and I will cause them to fall by the sword before their enemies, and by the hands of them that seek their lives; and their carcasses will I give to be meat for the fowls of heaven, and for the beasts of the earth."

Much other testimony might be adduced to prove that *Gehenna*, the valley of Hinnom was formerly a place of punishment by fire, etc., and certain portions

of Scripture indicate that it may again be a place of punishment by fire or otherwise unto destruction. It is not, however, anywhere intimated that it is a place where the wicked are being punished at the present time, nor that any wicked ones will ever be long kept alive in it. To assert that they will be is to speak against God, for He has called the place, *The Valley of Slaughter.*

"I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land."—Joel iii. 2. The valley of Jehoshaphat lies on the east of Jerusalem, and is called the valley of judgment. Jehoshaphat, it is said, we presume truly, means "The Lord Judge." If this prophecy of Joel relates to events yet future, then Mr. Read well observes: "As the feet of Christ are to stand on the Mount of Olives '*in that day*,' we can perceive, that as the mountains rise behind, his face will be toward Jerusalem; and if the nations are gathered before him, in the valley of Jehoshaphat, *Gehenna* will be on his *left hand;* and there probably many of the wicked will be consumed with fire from Heaven." In such an event *Gehenna* will be a place of future punishment. If this be so, will the fires of *Gehenna* be eternal? There is no passage of Scripture which teaches any such thing.

If we except the one instance of its use by James, and it is questionable whether it is really the word James used, Jesus is the only one who ever made use of the term *Gehenna,* in the whole New Testament, and he only used it in speaking to Jews. It was familiar to them, not only as a place where human sacrifices

were at one time offered; but also as a place of punishment by death, we may fairly presume, since their Scriptures speak of it as such. They were familiar with it, too, as the place where the offal of the city was thrown, as also not unfrequently the dead persons of malefactors, and where fires were kept constantly burning to *destroy* whatever was thrown there. They esteemed a denial of burial one of the very greatest of indignities. Solomon says, if a man "have no burial, an untimely birth is better than he." In addressing the Jews, therefore, no stronger expression could be used to represent *extinction of being*, nor one better calculated to be so understood than being *cast into Gehenna*, valley of Hinnom, or gehenna fire. As nothing cast there ever came out alive, but was wholly consumed, for what the fire did not burn, the worms destroyed, so when *gehenna* punishment was threatened they well knew it meant utter destruction.

Another fact must not be overlooked. Christ sometimes used the term *Gehenna* in denouncing judgments against wicked Jews. The following is an instance: "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" (Gehenna.)—Matt. xxiii. 33. The word translated "damnation," is *kriseos*, meaning judgment. The text more properly rendered, would read, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape *the judgment of* (*gehenna*) *the valley of Hinnom?* Gehenna, valley of Hinnom, is here named as the place of punishment of those wicked Jews, and the punishment was, of course, then future. Jesus said unto them: "Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes:

and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them ye shall scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation."—Matt. xxiii. 34, 35, 36. "And when ye" (believers) "shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them" (believers) "which are in Judea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled."—Luke xxi. 20, 21, 22. All this refers directly to the judgment in Matt. xxiii. 33.

The Jews certainly filled the measure of their fathers. They scourged, stoned, killed and crucified believers: they persecuted followers of Christ beyond measure. Such were well worthy of the judgment of *the valley of Hinnom.* Forty years later that judgment came; and how terrible was it! The city surrounded by the minions of Titus; anarchy, starvation, death, horrors of every description reigning within, the scenes then witnessed no pen can ever describe. So literally did the streets run with blood that fires were extinguished by it. More than eleven hundred thousand Jews lay, buried and unburied, about the city. They did not escape the judgment of the valley of *Hinnom.* Indignation and wrath came upon them

to the uttermost. Then did it transpire that men looked upon the carcasses of them that transgressed against the Lord, where their worm did not die, and where their fire was not quenched. That was the judgment that was nigh at the time Christ threatened the Jews, believers, if faithless, and unbelievers, with gehenna punishment. That was the punishment inflicted upon the disobedient and faithless of that generation.

Modern theology would have the text under consideration teach what they to whom the language was addressed could never have understood it to mean. It would have the expression *destroy* both soul and body in Gehenna, to mean that God will keep alive what it calls the immortal soul, in what it is pleased to call *hell,* until the resurrection, and that then He will keep alive both body and soul in the same place, and delight Himself in torturing them to all eternity. Who does not see from what has been said, that nothing could well be imagined which would be more foreign to the meaning of Christ's words, or more at variance with his teachings. What a perversion is it of the word of God! What blasphemy against God!

The nature and effect of punishment in Gehenna, the whole consequence of being cast there, whether dead or alive, was so well understood among the Jews, that it came to be recognized as well by other peoples round about, among whom it became a sort of familiar saying when threatening the greatest punishment. Illustrative of this is the following circumstance, which occurred long after the death of Christ.

In the early experience of Mahomet, as a prophet, so called, he had no more bitter and unrelenting enemy

than was his uncle Abu Lahab. Though subsequently a most faithful Mahomedan, he for some years lost no opportunity to oppose and persecute the prophet. When the time came for Mahomet, as he believed, to "announce publicly and boldly his doctrine, beginning with his kindred and tribe," he summoned all the Koreishites of the line of Haschem to meet him on the hill of Safa, in the vicinity of Mecca, when he would unfold matters important to their welfare. They assembled there, as requested, and among them was Mahomet's hostile uncle, Abu Lahab. When the prophet had fairly begun to discourse of his mission, and make known his revelations, Abu Lahab started up in a rage, upbraided him for calling them together for such a purpose, and catching up a stone would have hurled it at him. Mahomet turned upon the disturber, cursed the hand thus impiously raised, and predicted his destruction in the *fire of Jehennom;* with the assurance that his wife, Omm Jemil, would bear the bundle of thorns with which the fire would be kindled.

Of course the fact that had Mahomet understood any thing of a theological hell, he must have remembered that its fire of everburning brimstone would be quite sufficient to accomplish the purpose without the addition of a few fagots borne thither by the scoffer's wife, forbids the thought that any reference was had to such a place, and settles it that he simply used an expression of Jewish origin to convey the idea of punishment by burning to death.

Dr. Richard Watson, writing on Mark ix., where Gehenna is several times mentioned in connection with

the expressions, "their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," says:

"As the worm itself dies not, but destroys that it feeds upon, and as fire unquenched consumes that upon which it kindles, so when temporal judgments are expressed by this phrase the utter destruction of persons, cities, and nations appears to be intended."

In the Targum is the following paraphrase of Psa. xxxviii. 20: "They shall be consumed in the smoke of Gehenna."

"The early Christian writers plainly understood our word 'destroy' in its literal and ordinary sense. Tertullian paraphrases the passage (Matt. x. 28,) thus: 'Who is able to kill and destroy (occidere et perdere) both soul and body.' And Cyprian: 'Who can slay (occidere) both soul and body.' Likewise Jerome and Augustine. And Origen says: 'Who is able to destroy and blot out both soul and body, either in Gehenna or as he may choose.' And not only do the other terms used require the literal sense of the word 'destroy,' but the reason of the case demands it. Christ was 'the faithful and true witness.' And would he give his most solemn warning in ambiguous terms? The ordinary sense of the words plainly name an indefinite loss—the loss of being, and of eternal life; the literal loss of the soul. The same faithful witness elsewhere reminds us that to gain the whole world and lose the soul is a foolish exchange. Did he here expect us to understand that the soul is imperishable, that it can never be strictly lost, but that we have something infinitely worse to fear? 'Endless annihilation,' says the younger Edwards, 'is an *endless* or *infinite* punishment;' and the ordinary sense of Christ's words denotes extinction. Did he mean a two-fold infinitude of punishment?"—*Prof. Hudson.*

Augustine says, "The soul can die, it can be slain." "If the soul cannot be slain, how should our Lord, warning us, say, 'Fear Him?'"

We think we have heretofore sufficiently shown what the soul is. If "Rev." Mr. George does, others, we feel assured, *will not* fail to see that the text so confidently relied on by himself and other believers in inherent immortality is, rightly understood and reasonably interpreted, an unanswerable argument *against* the theory. May our blessed Lord help all his people to rightly understand it and, understanding it, so justly appreciate the truth it teaches that they will ever be preserved from grossly misrepresenting the character of God by attributing to him acts of most fiendish cruelty.

What but cruelty of the most unrelenting and malignant type could keep helpless beings in endless torture with no view to either their improvement or as warning to others. Such a proceeding could not be had for purposes of benefit to the tortured ones, since it is held that their sufferings are to be eternal; neither could it serve as a warning to others, for it is contended that when the damned begin to receive their torture in its full intensity time will have ended, and probation closed. Who can believe such a doctrine, and at the same time, bowing before the throne of grace, confidently lift the voice in solemn praise and adoration, saying, "Thou who art a God of Love, and whose tender mercies are over all thy works?" May all patrons of the torment theory diligently consider these things, prayerfully striving to weigh them well, to weigh them with the care and intelligence their immeasurable importance demands.

We have just received from Thomas Read, author of BIBLE *vs.* TRADITION, a note which contains the following:

"The Rev. N. D. George must have been driven to a very embarrassing perplexty when he founded one of his chief arguments against annihilation upon the ambiguous meaning of the phrase 'soul and body,' in such a text as Matt. x. 28, which fairly implies that in the event of apostacy, that God could and would (*apolesia*) annihilate both soul and body, whatever 'soul and body' may mean, in *Gahenna*, or valley of Hinnom, the place of capital punishment. Matthew, taken from the Custom House, wishes to write a history of Christ, soon after the death of Christ, to the Jews among whom all the facts of his history and genealogy were known. Shall he write it in the vernacular of the Jews? No. For supposing that language to be the Chaldee-Syriac, although allied to the Hebrew, it was then a living language, and in the absence of printing, liable to great alterations, and his people were soon to be scattered among the nations, and would not long remember this language. As the learned Jews were all acquainted with the Hebrew, which being a dead language, and therefore unalterable, it seems, at that time, more suitable than the Greek, which was not at the time much understood among the inhabitants of Judea, as the best medium for his gospel. That Matthew did write his gospel in the Hebrew language is the universal belief of antiquity.

It is a curious fact, bearing heavily upon the present controvery, which we commend to the attention of Rev. N. D. and his coadjutors, that the Hebrew language has no word equivalent to the Greek word *soma* or English word *body*, but the word *nephesh*, soul; which word, *nephesh*, was uniformly made to express *psuche*, *soma*, *soul* and *body*, Turn to a concordance of the Old Tes-

tament and where the word *body* occurs, it is *nephesh* in the Hebrew, except in one case, where it means carcase. As the Hebrews anciently knew no distinction between *nephesh, psuche, soma, soul* and *body*, so they needed no other word than *nephesh*, soul, to express all these terms. The Hebrew Scripture writers all wrote upon the theory of the unity of man; and as *nephesh* meant a breathing frame-work, it answered all their purposes. Translate the Greek of Matt. x. 28 into Hebrew, and that Hebrew into English, and it would read: 'Fear not those that can kill the soul, but are not able to destroy the soul: but rather fear him who is able to annihilate both soul and soul in the valley of Hinnom.' Now as Matthew did not write the last clause of this verse in this manner, we cannot learn from the present Greek text, the exact words that Matthew did use, although Luke xii. 4, 5, clearly expresses the sense."

The frequency with which Mr. George seeks refuge in Matt. x. 28 is strongly suggestive of a willingness on his part to place the issue of the controversy respecting annihilation on a single text. If this be so then, instead of the one he has selected, Matt. x. 28, which though ambiguous in the use of the phrase "soul and body," is manifestly opposed to the popular theory, we commend him to the unambiguous text, Acts iii. 23: "And it shall come to pass that every soul which will not hear that prophet shall be destroyed" (or utterly annihilated) "from among the people." Matt. x. 28 says, "God is *able* to destroy the soul;" but this text, Acts iii. 23, clearly and emphatically declares that God *will* utterly destroy the soul that will not hear Jesus. Surely the directness and unambiguity of the latter text entitles it to preference if any isolated passage is to be regarded as settling the question.

CHAPTER III.

PAUL'S HOPE.

"And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust."—Acts xxiv. 15.

EVERY thoughtful reader of ANNIHILATIONISM NOT OF THE BIBLE, must wonder what could have induced the author to devote a number of pages of his book to this text. Did he suppose his work could fall into the hands of any one so ignorant as not to know that nothing can by any possibility whatever be found in the text that can be tortured into so much as the remotest intimation that the wicked will not all be literally destroyed? What object could a person, writing against the plain, unqualified testimony of inspiration, that "all the wicked will He" (God) "destroy," have in view in giving so much space to the text? It is difficult to imagine any good reason.

Does the author himself believe there will be a "resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust?" His theory prohibits it. Are we asked how that can be? "Who believes that corpses are men? They are only the remains of men." So says Mr. George, as we have before noticed. The body, then, is no part of the man proper, and cannot, as a matter of course, be either holy or unholy. The immaterial soul is the *man*, just or unjust, as the case may be, consequently neither the just nor the unjust can have a resurrection from the *dead*, for neither of them die, except what he calls a spiritual death, and if he admits the unjust are to have

a future resurrection from such a state, he becomes involved in precisely what he severely denounces, viz., Universalism. Unless marvellously inconsistent, he must acknowledge that his theory precludes his believing what he affirms to be the assertion of Paul.

It is true that the text *seems*, at first glance, to be out of harmony with Paul's teachings generally, and to indicate the resurrection of the impenitent dead. As Mr. G. thinks it is a strong passage against the position that the righteous only will live again, we give it some attention. It will not be denied that upon the words *of the dead*, in the text, depends very much of the strength of what argument it is made to furnish in support of the theory of a resurrection of all mankind. Although the use of the definite article does not necessarily imply a reference to *all* the dead, as being subjects of the resurrection, it is nevertheless suggestive of the thought that they *may* all be meant.

If, however, Paul not only did not use the article, but also used neither of the words *of the dead*, then the language of the text cannot justly be thought to contain even an intimation that more than a part of the dead are referred to. Dr. Lange, together with the number of commentators by whom his Commentary is translated from the German, and edited, with additions, leave out the words in question. Other learned Bible students do the same. Dr. Alexander intimates that they should be left out of the text, and he does leave the article out of verses 7 and 8, of chap. xxvi., the first relating to Jews, and the latter to "dead."

Did Paul's hope, as expressed in the text, in xxiii. 6, and in xxvi. 7 embrace a resurrection of all the dead?

They who hold that the text teaches a universal resurrection must contend that it did. Upon such an assumption, was Paul's assertion, xxiv. 15, that his Jewish accusers *allowed his hope,* a justifiable one? They who so maintain will be under the necessity of showing that the Jews who made accusation against Paul believed in the resurrection of *all* the dead. This they may find a somewhat difficult task, for is it not true that the Pharisees themselves denied any resurrection whatever to some, at least, of the Gentiles, and to the incorrigibly wicked of their own people? What says Dr. Adam Clarke on the question? Writing on John vi. 49, "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead," he says—"It was an opinion of the Jews themselves, that their fathers who perished in the wilderness, should never have a resurrection. Our Lord takes them on their own ground: Ye acknowledge that your fathers who fell in the wilderness, shall never have a resurrection; and yet they ate of the manna: therefore that manna is not the bread that preserves to everlasting life, according to your own concession."

It will at once be seen that if Paul hoped for a resurrection of *all men,* and the Jews did not believe *all men* would be raised from the dead, then they did *not* "allow" his hope. But if Paul, preaching, as he did, Jesus and the resurrection, believed in the re-living of those only who fell asleep in Christ, and the Jews held to a resurrection of two classes among their own people, viz., the just and unjust, then they *did* "allow" his hope. They could not otherwise be said to allow his hope unless, indeed, it be held that he believed just as they did as to who would be subjects of the resurrec-

tion, which by no means appears to have been the case. The whole weight of Paul's teachings is unquestionably of a different character. For example: "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you."—Rom. viii. 11. Who can read this and many like sayings of Paul, and then suppose the apostle avowed before Felix that he believed in the resurrection of both just and unjust? The very thought is suggestive of absurdity. Do the ungodly have the Spirit of God dwelling in them? The question answers itself.

Dr. Alexander does not find in Acts xxiv. 15 any reference to a general resurrection. He says the character of the hope which Paul "still held in common with the unconverted Jews *seems* to be explained, in the last clause, as the hope of a general resurrection. But this was not held by the Sadducees, nor is it elsewhere represented as the great distinctive hope of Israel."

Says Mr. George, p. 40 of his book, "Paul hoped for the resurrection of *the dead*." If by *the dead* he means *all* the dead, then upon the authority of Dr. Lange, and other editors of the Commentary which bears his name; upon the authority of the American Bible Union, and also upon the authority of other Greek scholars we condemn the assertion as unfounded in fact, for they say the words *the dead* should not appear in the text. What Paul did hope for was a resurrection of dead (*men*). Mr. G., as we have seen, does not believe there are any dead *men* to have a resurrection. He differs very widely with Paul; but even if it were hard to decide which

is right, we would feel quite justified in giving Paul's faith the preference, for that apostle certainly has a reputation for soundness of doctrine which Mr. G. has not just yet succeeded in establishing, nor is he likely to succeed while Paul and his doctrines are remembered, unless he concludes to make his faith conform to the teachings of Paul.

He takes up LIFE FROM THE DEAD, turns to p. 45, and reads: "If the apostle *expected* the wicked would be made alive again, he could hardly *desire* it. Could it be an object of desire to see all the wicked in one vast company, weeping, wailing, crying for mercy, and mercy deaf to all their sorrows, anguish and despair? Could he *desire* to listen to the curses and blasphemies, and witness the rolling sea of wickedness that would pour forth from these revived sinners and blasphemers of all sorts?" And how, dear reader, do you suppose this is met? What argument is brought against it? Why, having read, he casts aside the book, raises his hands, apparently, in holy horror, and exclaims, Universalist argument! Pray don't get immoderate, good neighbor; be tranquil. Is the argument any the less sound because Universalists have chosen to use it? Is their touch so vile that it contaminates and curses everything that is subjected to it? Truth is truth wherever found or by whoever held.

We are sorry to trouble Mr. G——, and it does seem to trouble him, but we must, in common with the author of LIFE FROM THE DEAD, urge the fact that Paul's hope was based on a *promise;* for he said, chap. XXVI, "I stand and am judged for *the hope of the promise* made of God unto our fathers." Two things are unde-

niably true; first: the resurrection of the unjust to a life of unutterable anguish could not possibly have been an object of hope with Paul; second: such a resurrection, or a resurrection of such a class to such a state could not be considered in any sense a *promise*, but must, if proclaimed at all, have been announced as a threat. But the fact is, no such thing is found in the law or the prophets, for a resurrection from the dead is uniformly spoken of as the privilege of a class.

Dr. Alexander remarks as follows concerning the last clause of verse 7, chap xxvi," For which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews."

"Of (about, concerning) *which hope* I am accused (and that) by Jews (not the Jews), *i. e.*, by men whose whole religion rests upon the very hope which they accuse me of maintaining. The hope described in this verse cannot be that of a general resurrection, which is only partially revealed in the Old Testament," (not revealed at all, Dr., if by "general resurrection" you mean a universal one), "and was not held by all the Jews at this time."

Of verse 8, he says.—

"The reference is plainly to the resurrection of Christ, as the crowning proof of his Messiahship, and thus the nexus between this verse and the one before it, which appeared to be abruptly broken, is completely re-established, as if he had said, they believe in a Messiah, so do I; but they expect him yet to come, while I believe that he is come already, not without grounds or on hearsay, but God has identified him by raising him from the dead; and surely this, if properly attested, cannot be thought by any devout Jew to be beyond his power.' *Dead* (not *the dead*) is in Greek a plural, and by some explained as a generic form relating to a single

person; but it is rather an allusion to the general resurrection, of which Christ's was the pledge and the example."

We have quoted thus from Dr. Alexander to show, mainly, that, rigidly orthodox, so called, as he is, he does not find a *universal* resurrection taught in Acts xxiv. 15, and relative passages. "But" (raise dead) "is rather an allusion to the general resurrection, of which Christ's was the pledge and the example." We are pleased to have the Dr. thus plainly tell us what he meaus by "general resurrection." The terms embrace those of whose resurrection the resurrection of Christ was the *pledge* and the *example*. We thank the Dr. for so much frankness. Of course we must not for a moment entertain the thought that he can give any countenance whatever to the idea that the resurrection of Christ "was the pledge and the example" of the resurrection of the ungodly. Such a thought is too inconsistent to find place in his logical mind.

Says Mr. George, p. 43, Paul "is arraigned for heresy concerning the resurrection. He vindicates himself. His argument is this: 'If I am a heretic, then my accusers are heretics; for I believe with them concerning the resurrection.'" We have already shown that the Jews did *not* believe in a universal resurrection, and if Paul *did*, as is asserted, how could he be said to believe with them? If he believed with them, pray tell us on what ground he was "called in question" by them? The very fact of his being called in question is proof that there was a point of difference between him and them. We are led to wonder what can be the limit of our author's capacity for error on this subject.

Paul preached a resurrection from the dead through Jesus. In doing this he preached the resurrection of Christ, and that as a pledge and sample of the resurrection of the faithful. When king Agrippa came to Cesarea, Festus stated Paul's case to him, and said that when Paul's "accusers stood up, they brought none accusation of such things as I supposed: but had certain questions against him of their own superstition, and of one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive." Here was just the point of contest. Paul preached a resurrection of dead (not *the* dead, remember) through Jesus. He might have preached a resurrection of dead men just as much as he liked, and they never would have troubled him about it had he not made that resurrection conditional, depending upon Christ and his resurrection, on the one hand, and faith in Christ as the promised Messiah, on the other. They had killed Jesus as an impostor, and they denied that he was raised from the dead. They wanted to kill Paul also for teaching the people that Christ had risen, and that as a pledge of the resurrection of somebody else.

"Of the hope," said Paul, at his examination before the chief captain, "and resurrection of dead I am called in question." Of what hope, and a resurrection of what dead was Paul called in question? Why, the *resurrection* of the dead Messiah, of course, and the *hope* of a resurrection of all whom Christ had promised to raise from the dead. And this was the promise that was "made of God unto the fathers."

The simple facts, then, are these: The Pharisees desired to put Paul "out of the way" because he preached the resurrection of Christ, and through him the resur-

rectionof a class. In making complaint against him they were compelled, denying, as they did, that Jesus had been raised from the dead, to so put the charge as to involve the broad question of a resurrection. This Paul was quick to take advantage of by saying, substantially to Felix, "I am accused by these Jews of preaching a resurrection of dead (Christ), and of cherishing and proclaiming a hope of a resurrection, yet future, of other dead. My hope themselves allow, for they too believe there will be a resurrection of dead, not only of just but also of unjust."

"The Greek, as well as the Hebrew, was written without points. The E. V. uses the word *allow* with a comma after it, and has *a resurrection* in the nominative case, whereas in the Gr., and in the Lat., resurrection is in the accusative: and so the E. V., by putting *a resurreetion* in the nominative, was compelled to insert *that there* before its words *shall be a resurrection.* Now by inserting the true word *expect,* instead of *allow,* and putting no comma after expect, and striking out the E. V. word *the* before *dead* and before *just,* and putting *which resurrection* together, (they agreeing with each other in the accusative,) the E. V. verse, without filling the ellipsis, will read thus: And have hope toward God, which resurrection they themselves (the Pharisees) expect shall be of dead, both of just and unjust. And this plainly shows that there is an ellipsis after the words *toward* God. And by filling the ellipsis (as before) and taking out the comma and the improper words used in the E. V., the verse is perfectly plain: And have hope toward God, of a resurrection of dead, which resurrection they themselves expect shall be of dead, both of just and unjust."—*Theology of the Bible.*

Jesus warned the disciples, Matt. xvi. 6, saying:

"Take heed, and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees." Did he not thus condemn the doctrine of both, showing that the Sadducees were wrong in saying there will be no resurrection; and that the Pharisees were wrong in saying the unjust will be raised? We think so. The reader will permit us, in recapitulation, to direct attention to some of the points which we have fully established.

First: Paul's Jewish accusers, while they held to a resurrection of two classes, just, and unjust, (the latter not embracing all the ungodly) of their own people, denied that certain others would have a resurrection.

Second: Paul's *hope*, therefore, could not have embraced *all* the dead, for had it done so he could not truly say that the Pharisees allowed his hope.

Third: Patrons of the universal resurrection theory —and this is true in an eminent degree of Mr. George, build their argument almost wholly, so far as relates to Acts xxiv. 15, upon the presence in the text of the words *of the dead*, an expression which, as we have abundantly shown from their own authorities, is not found in the original, the Greek, and should not appear in the E. V. text. It is significant that the oldest copies of the Syriac are without the words rendered *both of the just and unjust*. As they are not found in the older copies, the question very naturally arises, how came they in the later ones? If they were found in the earlier but were wanting in the later ones, we might justly conclude they had been accidentally omitted, but it is not so easy to explain the matter as it stands. While we call attention to the fact, we do not ask that it be regarded as favoring our exposition of the text, for the

reader has, we think, already seen that to be just, consistent and Scriptural.

Few things, it seems to us, are plainer than that the use of the text in question to support the theory of a universal resurrection is subversive of principles of correct exegesis, is a perversion of palpable Scripture testimony, and is thus, of necessity, highly injurious to the interests of truth.

CHAPTER IV.

THE PENITENT THIEF. PARADISE.

"And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise."—Luke xxiii. 42, 43.

In order to an intelligent examination of these texts, it will be necessary to first consider the term *paradise*, and see whether the current theory, that the word is used in the New Testament to denote the intermediate state of the saints, has any foundation in fact, or whether it is an assumption merely, having no better object for its adoption than the meeting of an emergency.

Our Rev. author, adopting the popular notion, affirms: "Paradise is a place of happiness in hades."—P. 117. He asserts that the soul of Christ went there. He further says of this place, that "it may be called heaven." —P. 190. That it is an easier matter to make assertions than to support them by facts or sound logic the above-quoted remarks indicate. We will see whether such an affirmation concerning *paradise* is justifiable.

The term paradise, Heb., *pardes*, Gr., *paradisos*, sig-

nifies, literally, a garden or pleasure-ground planted with trees, flowers, etc. Dr. Adam Clarke, in his notes on Gen. ii. 8, states that Wilmet supposes it to be a Persian word; and the Dr. says, "in *Arabic* and *Persian* it signifies a garden, a vineyard." The Septuagint render Gen. ii. 8, thus, "God planted a paradise in Eden." Dr. Albert Barnes says, paradise is a word of Persian origin, and means a garden, particularly a garden of pleasure, filled with trees, shrubs, fountains and flowers. Dr. Owen remarks:

"The word is a strictly Oriental one, signifying a *park* or *pleasure-ground.* The word is used by the lxx. for the garden of Eden. Whether it is of Arabic or Sanscrit origin, is uncertain, and immaterial to the present point. It is sufficient that it was a word in universal use among the Eastern nations to denote beautiful gardens, pleasure-grounds, parks, etc. . . . As the paradise in Eden, the primeval place of beauty and happiness had been closed to the human family after the apostacy, our Lord seems to have selected this term as expressive of the fact, that a higher and more blessed paradise was now to be opened to the race; that the paradise *lost* was now to be *regained,* and rendered accessible to all, who by faith would so unite themselves to the *second* Adam, as to entitle them to be with him in blessedness and glory."

Whatever the origin of the word, it is certain that it was extensively used by various nations in the East. Xenophon calls the parks and hunting-grounds of the Persian monarchs and nobles, *paradises.*

Just such a garden, a paradise was created by God in the beginning, and given to man, conditionally, as

his abode. It was a sample of the condition to which the whole earth would in process of time have been brought by Adam and his posterity had man by obedience developed a character in harmony with God. "And God blessed them" (Adam and Eve) "and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and *subdue* it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth'.'—Gen. i. 28.

To a race enjoying Edenic advantages, the whole work of subduing the earth and making it like the pattern furnished by the Creator would have been easy, delightful and glorious. By disobedience, however, sin entered, and the curse fell upon man, and upon the ground for his sake. Unto Adam God said, "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life: thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee. . . . In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground. . . . Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden (paradise) "of Eden," to till the ground from whence he was taken."—Gen. iii. 17, 18, 19, 23. Thus it is seen that when, after the fall, the curse was pronounced, the *paradise* of Eden ceased to be. As it was a pattern or sample of the perfection to which the race would, had not sin entered the world, have brought the earth, so may it still be regarded as the type of what the earth will be, as the inheritance of that spiritual race whose head is Christ, the second Adam.

Since the fall, there has been no such paradise in existence, because the curse has not been removed. The two cannot exist together. When there was a paradise, as an inheritance of sinless beings, on the earth, there was no curse; but when, in consequence of disobedience, sin entered the world the curse was pronounced, and so while that remains there can be no paradise. If it is found that the word of God brings to view a time when the curse will be removed, we may justly believe that paradise will be restored. If in addition to this we find inspiration portraying a time of future paradisaic peace and glory on the earth, a reasonable exercise of faith will grasp it. But if, at last, we find the Holy Spirit proclaiming it, and giving visions of its actual establishment in heavenly beauty and glory on the earth, then we are bound to expect its restoration. The word of God does plainly declare that there will come a time when "there shall be *no more curse.*"

Nebuchadnezzar saw in vision a great image representing, as declared by inspiration, a line of great and powerful kingdoms located on the earth. These kingdoms ended with a division into ten parts, ten smaller kingdoms, or powers. "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever."—Dan. ii. 44. As these prophetic kingdoms were all located on the earth, so must the universal and everlasting one which the God of heaven will set up be located on the earth also. "And the kingdom and dominion and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be

given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom."—vii. 27.

This everlasting kingdom is the kingdom of Christ, the "stone" which, as seen in the vision interpreted by Daniel, "was cut out of the mountain without hands, and" that "brake in pieces" all the others, and "became a great mountain, and filled the *whole earth*." When this kingdom has been established, and Christ has subdued the nations, then will be heard the great voices, saying," The kingdoms of *this world* have become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever."—Rev. xi. 15. At this time, too, will be accomplished that which God spake by the mouth of His prophet, Isaiah: "For, behold, I create new heavens, and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered," (because of the perfection and glory of the latter) "nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice forever in that which I create."—Isa. lxv. 17, 18. Of the promised land it is said: "And the desolate land shall be tilled, whereas it lay desolate in the sight of all that passed by. And they shall say, This land that was desolate is become like the *garden of Eden*."—Ezek. xxxvi. 34, 35.

The whole earth is promised to Christ for a kingdom, and to the saints for an inheritance. "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare my decree. The Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me; and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession."—Psa. ii 6–8." Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and

his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."—Isa. ix. 6, 7. "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."—Luke i. 32, 33.

Will there be paradisaic perfection and delights at that time? Will the righteous triumph and rejoice? In his days shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth." Psa. lxxii. 7. The Spirit portrays in exalted strain the peace and glory that will be enjoyed upon the renewed earth (paradise restored) by all the redeemed ones. "Righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling together. . . . The cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. . . They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."—Isa. xi. 6-9. All this is but a sample of the very much that is said respecting the state of things on the earth when that (paradise) which was lost in Adam shall be restored in Christ.

Let us now see whether the future restoration of par-

adise has been surely set forth by the Spirit. Many years had elapsed since the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ: the gospel had been preached to various nations, and the Christian religion was rapidly increasing when John, an exile on Patmos, received a revelation from him that liveth and was dead." The revelation was of "things which must shortly come to pass;" and it opened to view the events of various periods reaching to the personal return of Christ, and the setting up of the heavenly kingdom of which we have spoken. "He that hath an ear," saith the messenger, "let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches: to him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which stands in the midst of the paradise of God." When paradise existed in the beginning, the tree of life stood in the midst of it; and in the passage just quoted, a promise is made to them that overcome, and it that is they shall eat of the "tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise."

The book of Revelation is prophetic. The things that were revealed to John were then in the future; they were things which should "come to pass." When John heard the above words of promise he had not yet come to the paradisaic part of the vision, but was simply told of a blessing that awaits the faithful. He saw kingdoms strong and mighty set up and cast down. He beheld woes, and plagues, and judgments terrible inflicted upon nations and peoples, and saw great anti-christian powers annihilated. He saw the faithful subjected to persecutions bloody and diabolical, and he finally beheld "a new heaven and new earth," and the "new Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as

a bride adorned for her husband. . . . In the midst of the street of it . . . was there the tree of life . . . and there shall be no more curse." We have, then, the unfailing word of God for it, that paradise shall be restored, but not until the Lord shall gather out "all things that offend, and them which do iniquity." We have now seen that paradise ceased to exist at the close of Adam's Edenic experience, and that it has not yet been re-established, but will be when "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."

We do not overlook the only other instance in the whole Bible of the use of the term paradise. That instance is 2 Cor. xii. 4: "How that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter." As evidence that *some* orthodox theologians, at least, do not regard Paul as claiming that any part of him had actually been admitted into heaven, we quote from Dr. Adam Clarke. He says:

Schoetgen "has shown, that *ascending to heaven,* or being *caught up to heaven,* is a form of speech among Jewish writers, to express the highest degree of inspiration. . . . If we may understand St. Paul thus, it will remove much of the difficulty from this place, and perhaps the unspeakable words, verse 4, are thus to be understood. He had the most sublime communications from God; such as would be improper to mention."

The Greek preposition rendered "up," in this text, is *eis,* and properly signifies at. . . . It sometimes means *being at,* either as close *beside,* or actually *within* . . . But it likewise denotes *motion* or *tendency toward* an

object, so as to arrive *at* it; and then may be rendered *to* or *into* when applied to *place: Bible vs. Tradition.* That this was a vision, Paul himself declares in ver. 1: "I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord." He saw two things in connection, viz., paradise and "the third heaven." And this paradise is just what John saw, on Patmos. He was, like Paul, *caught toward* it, so as to behold it, and see something of its glory.

We have seen what paradise is; now let us consult Peter regarding the "third heaven." He says, "by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: whereby the world that then was" (before the flood) "being over flowed with water, perished: but the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word, kept in store, reserved unto fire. . . . The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up (this language has, we believe, reference to the destruction of the present condition of things, otherwhere expressed as the gathering out of "all things that offend, and them which do iniquity.") Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth."

Dr. Clarke and others understand, and we think rightly so, "heavens" in the foregoing, as also in other passages, to relate to the atmosphere, etc., which surrounds the earth. What has Peter told us? Why, that the first heaven and the first earth were destroyed by water, "the flood;" that the second heaven and the second earth, now existing, shall be destroyed also, and

God has promised, after that, "new heavens and a new earth."

Paradise and the "third heaven, then, are coexistent. We have seen that the preposition *eis*, rendered up, in the passage, denotes *motion* or *tendency toward* an object so as to arrive *at* it, and may be rendered *to* or *into* when applied to place. Paul, in his vision, seemed to be transported beyond intervening time and events, *to* paradise and the third heaven, and saw them and the glory of them just as if they already existed.

Having seen that there has been no paradise, as a habitation for man, in existence since that created in the beginning ceased to be, let us consider the promise of Christ to the thief. It is not, of course, pretended that the text furnishes direct evidence of the immortality of the soul, or even of the existence of an immaterial soul entity, but supports it by implication. Our Saviour, it is said, promised that the thief should be with him in paradise that day, and as both of them *died* and were *buried*, it follows that they had soul entities which went to some paradise—a theological one, for instance. As the promise was made to a *personality*, one would naturally suppose some other inference would be drawn from the language, for if only some immateriality met somewhere, the event could not be reasonably considered a fulfilment of the promise, for that was made to a person, and it was that that person should be with the person of Jesus. Any claim, therefore, that the promise involves the idea of consciousness between death and the resurrection, is based upon the *assumption* that man possesses an entity capable of conscious existence

separately from the body. Thus the thing has first to be *assumed* in order to make texts *seem* to teach it.

It is said, Christ died, it is true, but his soul lived on; it went into hades, a place of conscious existence. Is it so? Listen to the testimony of the Spirit of the Living God: "Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth: my flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not *leave* my *soul* in hell (sheol), neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption."—Psa. xvi. 9, 10. David spake these words by the Spirit of God; and lest some should fall into the error of supposing he spoke of himself, we turn to Peter, who says that David "is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and . . . seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of *Christ*, that his soul was not left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption."

That in which the Spirit declared God would not leave the Christ soul, is *sheol*. Sheol is not a place, but a state, it is the grave in general sense, *i. e., the state of death.*

"The learned Tremellius, who was a Jew by birth, and professor of Hebrew at Sedan, where he died in 1580, translated the Syriac version of the Bible, the oldest version extant, into Latin. He uniformly rendered the Syriac synonym for *sheol* into Latin, by *sepulchr-um, i, o, u,* (the different endings showing only the different grammatical constructions) which means the sepulchre, grave, or tomb, excepting in one single instance, Psa. xlix. 4, last clause, where he has rendered it, *infernus, hell,* because he thought that the wicked could not be consigned to the same place as that from which the soul

of the Psalmist was redeemed. Yet he acknowledges that *sheol*, in most places, meant the general receptacle of the dead.

"In the French version, the word *sheol* is usually translated sepulchre, and only once *enfer*, *hell*, in Job xi. 8, where it has no relation to the dead, but is contrasted with the height of heaven."—*Bible vs. Tradition.*

Sheol is not a place of conscious existence. "For in death there is no *remembrance* of thee: in the grave" (*sheol*) "who shall *give thee thanks?*"—Psa. vi. 5. "Let the wicked be ashamed, and let them be *silent* in the grave" (*sheol*).—Psa. xxxi. 17. "*Like sheep* they are laid in the grave" (*sheol*). "But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave" (*sheol*). Are sheep conscious in the *state of death?* *Like sheep* the wicked are laid in *sheol*, consequently they must be unconscious. It will not do to say that the bodies of the wicked are laid like sheep in the "grave," for the Psalmist says the wicked themselves are thus laid; and, according to the popular theory, the undying soul is *the man*, the sinner. In order to help the popular theory concerning man's nature David should have said, "like sheep the *remains* of the wicked are laid in the grave." Of course, he would have been at variance with himself, and would have stated that which was not true, for the wealthy sinners of whom David speaks, whose "inward thought" was "that their houses shall continue forever, and their dwelling-places to all generations;" who called "their lands after their own names," had stately funerals, and were, in that respect, laid in the grave more like kings and princes than "like sheep."

"For the grave" (*sheol*) "cannot *praise* thee; death cannot *celebrate* thee."—Isa. xxxviii. 18. Sheol, says Mr. George, is the same as hades, and there the righteous *do* "praise" and "celebrate" God. "For there is no *work*, nor *device*, nor *knowledge*, nor wisdom, in the grave" (*sheol*) "*whither thou goest.*"—Eccl. ix. 10. Our friends on the other side of the question contend that there *is* wisdom, knowledge, and device in hades, the Greek term which represents the Heb. *sheol*. "If mischief befall him by the way in which ye go, then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave" (*sheol*).—Gen. xlii. 38. Would the loss of a son cause good old Jacob to go sorrowing into this happy intermediate state, this "heaven?" All must see that *sheol*, into which the soul of Christ—Christ himself, went at death, is a state of unconsciousness.

The author of the work we review, having brought evidence to prove that some Jews believed hades to be an abode of departed spirits, remarks: "Peter, speaking of David's prophecy, says, 'He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell,' (*Hades*, the place of departed spirits.)" We presume it will not be further contended that *sheol* is a place of conscious existence, since we have abundantly shown otherwise; and hence the reader will perceive that the position of this writer renders necessary the use of *hades* in the foregoing quotation from Peter. The fact is Peter was talking to Jews particularly: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words:" consequently he would be likely to speak to them in their own tongue, or, quoting from Psalms, would at least be likely to use just the words which David used. He would not, therefore, use the

term *hades*, but *sheol*, the recorder of Acts having afterward used the term *hades* as the proper representative of *sheol*. Peter said to the "men of Israel," "Because thou wilt not leave my soul" (the term rendered soul expressing the whole Being of Christ) "in *sheol*, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." There is "no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in *sheol*." So says the word of God.

Is it still affirmed that hades is a state of happy consciousness? that it is, as contended by our author, the abode of departed spirits, and may be called *heaven?*" Paul declares that the righteous will, at the resurrection, come out of their graves, and shout the triumphant song, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave" (*hades*) "where is thy victory?" Is there any one so simple as to believe that Paul intended by this language to represent happy existences coming out of heaven and shouting over their deliverance, saying, "O heaven, where is thy victory?" And yet the theory of Mr. George would have us believe it. It is settled beyond reasonable controversy that Christ was in *sheol* between his death and resurrection, and could not, therefore, have been with the thief in any place of conscious existence.

Mr. G., speaking of the words, "his soul was not left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption," says: "Mark the distinction between soul and flesh." We venture the opinion that few if any, not blinded by prejudice, can read this text in the original and fail to see that the terms soul and flesh are synonyms, and represent the whole person of Christ. David said, "Because thou wilt not leave my soul in *sheol*, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." Is it

for one moment supposed by any advocate of the popular theory that *soul* and *Holy One* mean two different parts of Christ? They are too wise to admit that the body, a mere senseless tenement, according to their theory, was the Holy One, and thus open the door to a possible inference that the soul (their idea of soul) was not holy. Why did not our friend tell his readers to "mark the distinction between soul and" Holy One? The reason suggests itself.

Remember, Peter spoke to Hebrews, and, it is reasonable to suppose, used Hebrew terms. If this be so, the term which he used in saying, "his soul was not left," etc., was *nephesh*, a word of which Parkhurst declares he could find no passage where it undoubtedly means the spiritual part of man, or what is commonly denominated soul.

Murdock's Syriac translation reads: "And he foresaw, and spoke of the resurrection of Messiah, that he was not left in the grave, neither did his body see corruption. This Jesus hath God resuscitated; and we are all his witnesses."—Acts ii. 31, 32. Take notice, the Syriac has *he* instead of the E. V. words *his soul;* and it has *grave*, instead of *hell*. This is correct, for Christ himself went into the grave; Christ himself died, and was "resuscitated." Although the proper meaning of hell rightly enough expresses that of grave, its theological meaning is a gross perversion. Hades, rendered hell in the text, means grave, as the Syriac has it, and, we venture to affirm, is not once used in the Bible to denote a place of separate conscious existence of any part of man.

There is absolutely nothing connected with the text,

Luke xxiii. 43, that gives any countenance to the idea of the existence of a conscious entity between death and the resurrection, except the punctuation, and that only as the reader assumes the very thing the text is wanted to prove. The comma being placed after *thee*, the sense of the text is that the promise of Jesus would be fulfilled the day it was made, hence it is concluded that as Christ and the thief both *died* (though the theory we oppose denies that either Jesus or the thief died; only their tenements, their "remains,") there must have been some part of each which existed in consciousness, and were together in paradise.

If the comma be placed after *to-day*, the sense will be that the promise was given that day, and would be fulfilled at some time then future. Thus it is obvious that upon the punctuation depends all the argument that advocates of the doctrine of man's immortality seek to draw from the text. We must not overlook the fact that while the words are the words of Jesus, the punctuating is done by the translators, the original being without it. There was no approach to a regular system of punctuation until the sixteenth century.

Those who contend that the text, just as it stands, correctly represents the promise of Jesus to the thief, and that it implies consciousness in death, are compelled, as we have said, to assume, first, that there is a part of man which does not die; and second, that there is somewhere a place called paradise, to which this undying part repairs at the death of the other part. The former, we assert, is wholly unjustifiable in view of the fact that the word of God always represents man as mortal, and

the race as perishing, naturally, and the latter we have shown to be untrue.

Paradise, says Mr. George, "may be called heaven." Then God must be there. But Jesus, after his resurrection, said to Mary, "I am not yet ascended to my Father." It is replied to this: "what we assert is, that the Saviour and the thief had each a distinct entity, called the soul . . . that these souls, after their departure from the body, were together in paradise." The assertor of this must surely overlook the fact that the *me* with whom the thief was promised to be, is the same *me* whom Mary was told not to touch for he had "not yet ascended," etc. If an immaterial entity was the *me*, how could Mary touch it? The idea is somewhat absurd. As the soul is asserted to be the *man*, the real personality, it must, of course, have been the "I" which had "not yet ascended" to the Father; and yet it is affirmed that Christ's soul did go to heaven the day of the crucifixion. We hope to be preserved from ever being thus brought into conflict with the testimony of Christ. What a cruel theory to be ever leading its patrons into such dangerous errors. In no sense was there fulfilled such a promise as it is alleged Christ gave the thief.

But there was a promise, and it will surely be fulfilled. What was it? Jesus had for years been teaching that at a future time he would come and reign as king. For example: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all his holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory."—Matt. xxv. 31. Of this fact the thief was probably not ignorant, and doubtless being impressed that Jesus was no deceiver, he cried unto him, "Lord, remember me when thou *comest in thy*

kingdom." What an idea they must have of Christ's kingdom who assume that it is located in hades! We have seen that the establishment of Christ's kingdom will be the re-establishment of paradise; so the Saviour's promise, "thou shalt be with me in paradise," is in perfect harmony with the prayer.

Lange's Commentary says, the thief "represents to himself the moment when the Messiah comes in his kingly glory to erect his kingdom upon earth, and desires that he then, awakened from the grave, may enter in with Him into the glory of his Lord." Consonant to this is the following from Archbishop Whately. He says: "Observe that 'into thy kingdom,' is a mistranslation; it should be, 'in thy kingdom.' The meaning is, at thy second coming in triumphant glory."

Whately further says, the malefactor looked "for a kingdom of God which the death of Jesus was not to destroy, but to complete; he understood that in some way or other, the Christ must suffer these things, and enter into his glory." Other learned and eminent commentators admit that the thief expected his prayer would be answered at some future time. We are compelled to the conclusion that, strange as it may seem, the malefactor was the first to perceive any thing of the deep meaning of the superscription over the cross, and was the first to herald the Lord's royal dignity; and that, too, at the very moment when the Messianic hope of the apostles themselves, though they were directly instructed by Christ, was most terribly shaken.

We have seen that Lange, Whately and others, including, we believe, Scott and Barnes, either hold or admit that the thief expected his prayer would be answered

when Christ should set up his kingdom, or at some time subsequent to the day of crucifixion. This position could only be adopted by these men upon one of two principles. Either they must in their own minds place the comma after "to-day," the idea thus being that Jesus *that* day promised the thief should be with him at some future time; or else they must accept the term "to-day" in the strict sense of *this* day, a proper thing to do, as it may justly be so translated; the meaning thus being either just the same as in the other case or that *this* referred to the day of the establishment of Christ's kingdom. When people find fault with us for taking some account of the punctuation and showing a manifest error in it, they forget that the service which they compel the text to yield to their theory is based *wholly* on the punctuation.

We believe the term paradise, in the text, refers to the heavenly paradise which is to be established on the earth at the coming of Christ; and that Jesus gave the thief the promise of being with him at that time. While the text admits of several reasonable interpretations, and all in perfect harmony with the view of the unity of man's nature, it cannot be used in support of inherent immortality without first *assuming* the very thing to be proved, thus doing gross violence to some of the most palpable principles of Scripture exposition.

When paradise shall be re-established; when the hills shall laugh in their beauty, and the valleys sing the Redeemer's praise; when the "wilderness shall be glad," and the "desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose;" when the whole earth shall be robed in garments of unfading loveliness, and become one broad highway

of holiness, one great paradise with no spot on all its wide extent to send up the wail of sorrow; when the "throne of God and the Lamb shall be in it," and the redeemed shall "see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads;" when "the ransomed of the Lord" shall "come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy," then will all Divine promises be fulfilled: then will faith and hope be swallowed up in the full fruition of paradisaic glory.

"The earth shall all be paradise."—*Milton.*

Our Lord and Master said, "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth;" and God, by the mouth of His prophet, had long before promised, "the meek shall inherit the earth, and delight themselves in the abundance of peace." The meek do not now delight themselves in abundance of peace, nor will they until Zion's King shall *destroy* them that corrupt the earth, and shall establish a peace based on universal Christian brotherhood, and perfect knowledge of and obedience to the Divine will. It is here that the "Son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory;" and where our blessed Lord and Saviour reigns as king, and rules in righteousness, there will the saints find it ineffable delight to be. May all our readers so live that they shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, for thus shall an entrance be secured into immortality and glory. Let us by both precept and example do all we can in inducing others to join us in earnestly and faithfully striving to possess at last that unspeakably blessed prize, *life in the eternal kingdom soon to be set up.*

CHAPTER V.

PART I.

"For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," etc.—2 Cor. v. 1–9.

OUR author, in his opening remarks on this text, affirms that they who deny the existence of an immaterial soul-entity find "this passage, like many others," "difficult to dispose of." Of a certain writer's explication of the text he remarks, "that his effort is not to bring out the obvious meaning of the text, but to *destroy* it, and make a noise to bewilder the reader." He finally more than intimates that said writer uses certain arguments because they "are absolutely necessary to make a smoke under which to murder the text."

A certain noted author was, while on his death-bed, afforded blessed peace and comfort by the thought that he could not remember to have written any thing which, standing upon the threshold of the tomb, he would recall, were it in his power to do so. The above noted and many other similar remarks of Mr. George must be thought by every cultivated mind, whether religious or not, to be very unworthy a professed lover of Jesus. It is not easy to see how he could so far forget the high and holy principles he professes, and doubtless does labor to maintain, as to be found thus impugning the motives of other servants of Christ. To every Christian reader it presents proof of the great need of prayerful care lest we bring reproach upon the cause of righteousness.

Casting over the remarks the mantle of charity, and

assuming that they were made under the influence of some undue momentary excitement which prevented a recognition of their full import, we will cherish the hope that whether lying at the door of death, or whether standing before the judgment seat of Christ, where, as said Paul, believers must all appear, his thoughts may not be haunted by recollections of them, nor any future hours made sad by vain wishes that they had never been uttered.

The text, not unlike others, *is* a "difficult one to dispose of," and we humbly suggest to all, whatever may be their faith, the eminent propriety and wisdom of not attempting it. The experiment would of necessity prove extremely hazardous. No, good Christian friend George, don't undertake to *dispose* of it yourself; and if you find any one else trying to do so, dissuade them, if possible, from the undertaking. Prayerfully and carefully seek to *understand* it, and then it will not be thought necessary to *dispose* of it. He asks:

"If man is not a compound being, what is the *we* dwelling and groaning in the 'tabernacle;' the *we* 'at home in the body;' the *we* which can be 'absent from the body, and be present with the Lord;' the *we* who 'know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved,' *we* have a heavenly building?"

In reply to the above we remark, that, beyond all reasonable question, the *we* of whom Paul spoke were himself and the Corinthian brethren to whom he wrote. Our seeming excited author says: "The honest mind perceives at once that the sentiment is, that men may be absent from the body in a conscious state." Only the *dishonest* mind, then, "perceives" otherwise. How sad, how very sad is it to find a Christian writer manifesting

such a spirit in opposing what he *believes*, of course, to be error. We should think he would esteem it wise, nay indispensable to evince that sweet spirit of Christian kindness and tenderness which dwells richly in hearts that love the Master and are consecrated to his service, and which followers of Jesus should *always* manifest in defending what they believe to be truth, leaving results with God. Doing otherwise reveals a want of faith in infinite power and wisdom, and brings reproach upon that in the supposed interests of which it is indulged.

That the texts teach a conscious existence of some part of man (the real man, as is claimed) between death and the resurrection is a bold assumption, for if it be *not true* that man is capable of such existence, then an explication which precludes that idea *must* be adopted. Then again, the language could not be held to *necessarily* teach an intermediate conscious existence, even were it admitted that man is immortal, for Paul evidently had no reference to an intermediate state of *any* kind.

It is maintained by most of those who affirm immortality of man, that the soul—a living, thinking immateriality—exists in a conscious state between death and the resurrection. How, upon such a theory, and that the "tabernacle," the "earthly house" is the human body, can the expression, "we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," be harmonized with their belief in the resurrection of the body? If Paul asserts by implication that a soul-entity goes to heaven, or some other place of happiness, at death, he also asserts that that soul-entity is, when it leaves the body, clothed upon with

"an house not made with hands," a "building of God," which is eternal. Thus the soul has an eternal body given it at death, and at the resurrection the two entities must be put into the resurrected body, and so man will thenceforth be composed of a soul and two bodies. Defenders of the popular theory cannot escape this conclusion, extremely absurd though it is. If, in attempting to escape it, they urge that the heavenly "building," or "house" is the state of heavenly blessedness, etc., then the question arises, why not apply the same rule of exposition to the expression "earthly house?" Consistency would demand that it be done notwithstanding the fact that doing it would render the text utterly useless to their theory.

Dr. Lange remarks:

"The present tense would seem to refer to some period immediately after death. But if the soul is to have a body corresponding to its condition at that time (of which, to say the least, the Scriptures distinctly say nothing) then the dwelling here mentioned cannot be eternal. Nor would what is said in ver. 2 of our house which is from heaven, agree very well with such an assertion."

The apostle is not, as is generally understood, speaking of the human body, but of the state of man in the present condition of things; and he contrasts it with the state which will exist after the resurrection, the final consummation. The present state of man is compared to a temporary residence in a transitory tabernacle, fixed upon the ground for a short time, then taken to pieces. Man's state in a future, or resurrection life is compared to a residence in a magnificent building, such as no human power can make, and which will endure eternal-

ly, not being liable to ruin, nor to be taken to pieces; a building of which God is the maker, and which He will, in his appointed time, send down from heaven. Agreeably to this a learned divine who wrote about fifty years ago, says:

"And here it is proper to observe, that the apostle does not affirm that the virtuous in a future state will dwell in heaven, but only that the house, which is hereafter intended for them, is *now* in heaven, and will at the proper time descend into this world, which he more explicitly asserts in the next verse. The meaning, therefore, of the apostle's declaration, stripped of its metaphorical dress, is this: We know that when the present frail and mortal state is passed, it will be succeeded by a state of everlasting glory and felicity, which God has prepared for all his faithful servants."

"For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."—Ver. 4. Of this verse, the same writer says:

"In this state of frailty and suffering, we who are heirs of the promised inheritance often groan under the pressure of fatigue, affliction, and persecution, and earnestly desire to be released from the burden. Not indeed that we desire death for its own sake, and much less do we covet that state of insensibility to which death, for a time reduces us: the object of our desire is, to enter upon a new and happy state of existence, and if possible, to escape the pains of dying, and the disgrace of the tomb, so that this frail, mortal condition might be immediately absorbed and lost in a state of immortality and blessedness."

Says Archbishop Whately

"This passage would, I say, of itself, seem to relate

to the condition of the soul separate from the body; and indeed some commentators have referred to it as regarding the separate state. But they should have remembered that the apostle is most evidently alluding to the state, whatever it is, in which we are to *appear before Christ's judgment seat;* so that if we are *then* to have bodies, he cannot be supposed, without a very forced and harsh interpretation, to be speaking of a separate state, in the words immediately preceding.

"And if you look a little further back, Paul himself furnishes a ready interpretation of his own expression here: 'We know,' say she, 'that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God—a house not made with hands—eternal in the heavens.' . . . Having spoken of the burden of that corruptible body which we now inhabit, he adds this caution, on purpose, as it seems, to guard against the supposition that the deliverance he looks for from this burden, is a separate state of the soul: What we desire, he says, is, 'not to be unclothed' (namely, as in a separate state), but the hope we cherish is, he says, 'to be clothed upon,' that is, to have an addition made to what we now possess, by being placed in a far superior habitation."

We quote also from Milton, who says:

"It is sufficiently apparent, however, that the object of this passage is not to inculcate the separation of the soul from the body, but to contrast the animal and terrestrial life of the whole man with the *spiritual* and heavenly. Hence in the first verse 'the house of this tabernacle' is opposed, not to the soul, but to 'a building of God, a house not made with hands,' that is, to the final renewal of the whole man, as Beza also explains it, whereby 'we are clothed upon.' (The E. V. adds, ver. 2, 'with a house which is from heaven') 'being clothed . . . not naked,' ver. 3. This distinctly appears from ver. 4: 'not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed

upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life.' See also ver. 5, 'now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing;' not for the separation of the soul from the body, but for the perfecting of both. Wherefore the clause in the eighth verse, 'to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord,' must be understood of the consummation of our happiness; and 'the body' must be taken for this frail life, as is common in the sacred writers; or perhaps to be 'at home in the body, and to be absent from the Lord,' ver. 6, may mean nothing more than to be entangled in worldly affairs, and to have little leisure for heavenly things; the reason of which is given in ver. 7, 'for we walk by faith, not by sight:' whence it follows, ver. 8, 'we are confident and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord;' that is, to renounce worldly things as much as possible, and to be occupied with heavenly. The ninth verse proves still more clearly that the expressions 'to be present' and 'to be absent' both refer to this life: 'wherefore we labor that whether present or absent, we may be accepted with God:' for no one supposes that the souls of men are occupied from the time of death to that of the resurrection in endeavors to render themselves acceptable to God; that is the employment of the present life, and its reward is not to be looked for till the second coming of Christ.' 'The same sense is to be ascribed to 2 Pet. i. 13, 14, 15; 'as long as I am in the tabernacle,' etc., that is in this life."

On ver. 1, Lange further remarks: "It is hardly probable that such a man would have changed his mind so soon after writing the fifteenth chapter of his former Epistle to the Corinthians, and so should now have believed that he was to pass immediately at death into the blessedness of the resurrection body." Concerning the words *absent from the body, and present with the Lord,* Rev. Thomas Belsham remarks:

"That is, to quit the present state, and to enter upon that state of recompense and happiness which we are to enjoy with Christ. This text is usually understood as expressing the apostle's persuasion, that death is a separation of the soul from the body, and his expectation that the separate spirit would be introduced into a state of glory and happiness in the presence of Christ, while the body is perishing in the grave. But it is quite impossible that this should be the apostle's meaning, as he had expressly declared in his former epistle, 1 Cor. xv. 18, that if there be no resurrection of the dead, all who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished; which is palpably inconsistent with their possessing life and happiness in a separate state; and the apostle cannot be supposed to contradict himself. And in truth, the apostle's language in this passage will not bear the construction which is usually given to it; and gives no countenance to the doctrine of an intermediate state of perception, activity and enjoyment between death and the resurrection. He is here only contrasting the present state of trial and suffering with the future promised state of happy existence in the presence of Christ. He never once mentions or even glances at an intermediate state in which the spirit will be happy, when separate from the body. On the contrary, he represents the state which immediately succeeds to death, as a state of nakedness, ver. 3, which was so far from being the object of his wish, that he expresses his earnest desire to be exempted from it by being permitted to continue in the world till the appearance of Christ. That the apostle regarded the season of rest in the grave as an evanescent point, hardly worthy of notice when compared with the glory which was to succeed, cannot reasonably be doubted."

The texts we have been considering will now be given as rendered in Lange's commentary, a work representing the critical ability of a large number of Bible students,

and the reader will see at a glance the propriety and soundness of our exposition of them, and their entire harmony with our view of man's nature and destiny.

"For we know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle (tent dwelling) were dissolved, we have (in the heavens) a building of (from) God, a house not made with hands, eternal (,) in the heavens (om. in the heavens). For in this (also) we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with (to put on over this) our house which is from heaven: if so be that (since indeed) being clothed we shall not be found naked. For (even) we that are in this (the) tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, (because we are not willing to be unclothed), but clothed upon, that mortality (our mortal part) might be swallowed up of (by) life. Now (But) he that hath wrought us (out) for the self-same thing is God, who also (om. also) hath given us the earnest of the Spirit."

Dr. Priestly says of ver. 10, "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ," "This clearly shows that the views of the apostle were not directed to any thing short of the resurrection of the dead and the future judgment; and that he had no prospect of any reward before that time. This, therefore, is the *key* by which we must interpret all that precedes this verse." So we think.

We have found Whately, Belsham, Milton, Priestly, and others advocating our explication, substantially; and we have found Lange and others opposing that of Mr. George notwithstanding he confidently says, "The honest mind must perceive at once that the sentiment is, that men may be absent from the body in a conscious state." We turn sadly away from this and like expres-

sions, and trust we may not again meet with such a display, especially in connection with remarks upon a text concerning which so great want of proper information is betrayed.

We do not believe that any, having attentively read the foregoing remarks, will entertain grave doubts as to their soundness and truthfulness, but should they do so we will not even intimate that they are other than altogether "honest." When theologians of the popular faith write concerning the theory of consciousness in death, they use language vastly different from any thing that can be found in Paul's writings. But then, of course, Paul did not learn that kind of theology. We confess to a decided preference for the Pauline sort.

Part II.

"And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit! and he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep."—Acts vii. 59, 60. "And devout men carried Stephen to his burial, and made great lamentation over him."—Chap. viii. 2.

Concerning this text little need be said. They who so zealously defend the punctuation of Christ's promise to the thief, being well aware that its seeming service of their theory results wholly from the punctuation of the text, lose their ardor for that kind of defence when they reach here. None will deny that the text as it stands attributes the act of *calling upon God* to the murderous Jews. We might, therefore, press against the popular theory so much of the sentiment of the text as is due to the style of punctuation, but, recognizing the fallibility of the translators, we freely admit that

the circumstances of the case render it certain that it was Stephen who thus called. Dr. Alexander renders the text thus: "And they stoned Stephen calling (upon God) and saying," etc.

Our author, like many others of his faith, finds it very convenient sometimes to assume that "spirit" and "soul" are one and the same. "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of *soul* and *spirit*," etc.—Heb. iv. 12. If soul and spirit are one and the same, and an immaterial entity, how, pray tell us, can they be divided? Is such an entity, notwithstanding "indivisibility" has so long been affirmed of it, after all capable of being torn asunder? But the passage certainly indicates that soul and spirit are two things, and as such are capable of being separated. So, too, the following:

"And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."—1 Thess. v. 23. Do men possess two abstract entities capable of conscious existence separately from the organization and from each other? If so, and the *soul* is *the man*, what sort of an existence is the spirit? Our author's theory makes the living being called man a most singular complication, unlike any thing in the heavens above or in the earth beneath, so far as either science or revelation enlighten us.

When Samson was at one time "sore athirst" he said, "and now shall I die for thirst, and fall into the hands of the uncircumcised?" But water was given

him: "and when he had drunk, his spirit came again, and he revived."

The theory of so-called orthodox theologists is that when what they call the spirit leaves the organization the body is dead. If this be so then Samson must have been dead when he drank the water, for it was not until he drank that his "spirit came again and he revived." They will hardly insist that this passage teaches the existence of a spirit entity; and yet they would vigorously urge it as proof of such existence did not the act of drinking precede the return of the departed spirit. Of course, the spirit that returned was nothing more than Samson's *animation, vigor.*

A nearly famished Egyptian was found and brought to David, who furnished him with food. "And when he had eaten, his spirit came again to him."—1 Sam. xxx. 12. This is another instance of a man's spirit leaving him, and being brought back again by taking nourishment. Nobody will be so simple as to suppose that a conscious spirit-entity is here referred to. It would, however, be no more unreasonable than is the same supposition concerning many other texts that are urged in support of the spirit-entity theory.

The Greek term for *spirit,* in the text, Acts vii. 59, is *pneuma.* Its corresponding, or Hebrew term is *ruah.* They are generally translated spirit; but they are also rendered *breath, air, wind, mind, life, disposition,* etc. Like the Hebrew term *nephesh,* rendered soul, it is sometimes applied to the beasts. That it *ever* means an entity in man capable of conscious existence when separated from the organization, we deny, since there is absolutely no proof of it.

Pneuma, the principle of life, is sometimes, as may be the case in the record of Stephen's death, put for life itself. "Pull me out of the net that they" (David's enemies) "have laid privily for me; for thou art my strength. Into thine hand I commit my spirit: thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of truth."—Psa. xxxi. 4, 5. It will not be claimed that David wanted to die and hence desired that God might take away an immaterial, immortal spirit, for just the reverse is plainly true of the psalmist. His enemies planned his destruction. In the emergency he did not trust in himself, for it seemed that his enemies must triumph for aught he could do to prevent them; "but," said he, "I trust in the Lord." "Thou hast" heretofore "redeemed me, O Lord God of truth;" therefore "into thine hand I now commit my spirit," my life, for safety.

"For the which cause I also suffer these things: nevertheless I am not ashamed: for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which *I have committed* unto him against (unto) that day."—2 Tim. i. 12. What was it Paul committed to Christ, being persuaded that his Saviour is able to keep it until the day of final reward? All must admit that it was his life, that life which he possessed by virtue of union with Christ, the author of eternal life. It was not the natural life that Paul referred to: he had good reason to expect *that* would be destroyed by violence.

To the church at Colosse, Paul wrote: "Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead" (condemned to death, hence reckoned as dead) "and your life is hid with Christ in God."—

Col. iii. 2, 3. Here it is distinctly stated that it is a life which those believers committed to Christ, and it is "hid with" him "in God." That being the case, when will they receive that life, and thus enter upon their reward? Will it be at death? When Christ, who is our life, shall *appear, then* shall ye also appear with him in glory.—Ver. 4. It is at the *second coming of Christ* that saints enter upon their reward: it is then they receive eternal life in full and glorious reality.

Mr. George contends, and in this he simply echoes latter-day theology, that the *soul* was Stephen's self and he contends also that departed souls are in *hades,* which he also terms paradise, between death and the resurrection. If this be so, then, even if we admit the existence of a spirit-entity apart from the body, Stephen's prayer was not answered, and Stephen must, under such a supposition, have been well aware that it would not be, for though Christ was in *hades* (Bible hades) between his death and resurrection he is now, and was when Stephen was martyred, in heaven, sitting at the right hand of God. If, therefore, Stephen prayed Christ to receive a conscious spirit-entity, surely none will insist that he received answer to the prayer if that entity went directly to *hades,* there to remain until the resurrection morning.

Suppose we admit, for the moment, that a spirit-entity was Stephen's self, the person, the *real man;* what then? Would the admission help the theory we combat? By no means. The text distinctly states that Stephen, the *man,* "fell asleep," and that "devout men carried" *him,* the man, Stephen, "to his burial, and made great lamentation over *him.*" Why deny this ac-

count, and say *Stephen* did not fall asleep, and was not buried? We confess to an utter inability to discover any wisdom in a denial of this plain testimony of inspiration. We would not deny it on any consideration, however seemingly important.

Part III.

"For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward *man* is renewed day by day."—2 Cor. iv. 16.

A WRITER remarks concerning this language:

"From this it is often inferred, as Paul spake of an outer and inner man, man must be a double entity, having one real man inside of another. To this we have no great objection, but insist on knowing what the inner man is. It cannot be the immortal soul, for that cannot be renewed day by day: immortality is an unchangeable attribute."

To this Mr. George replies thus:

"The writer would cast dust in our eyes by stating that immortality is an unchangeable attribute, and, therefore, the soul cannot change in any sense. But did ever any one contend that immortality was the only attribute of the soul?"

If there is any *casting of dust* on the part of any one, in this matter, we think the reader will at once perceive who the guilty party is, and will say of Mr. G., "thou art the man." He claims that immortality is an attribute of the human soul, and at the same time he affirms the soul is the "inward (man)" which Paul said "is *renewed* day by day." This is an obvious contradiction. If immortality is an attribute of the human soul, then the soul cannot be *renewed*, and consequently cannot be that to which Paul referred in the

language under consideration. What is the meaning of renew? Webster defines it,—

"To make over as good as new; to restore to former freshness or perfection; to give new life to; to restore; to re-establish."

Paul uses the term in the sense of making new spiritually; being transformed. "Be ye transformed by the *renewing* of your mind."—Rom. xii. 2. *Renewed*, therefore, as used by Paul in 2 Cor. iv. 16, necessarily implies a tendency on the part of the "inward (man)," in the absence of the renewing power, to decay, to wasting away, to disestablishment. Hence we say, if the expression "inward (man)" has reference to an entity in man, then the text proves beyond controversy that immortality is not an attribute of that entity, for it must be a fact, of course, that immortality is not subject to any wasting process, and cannot, therefore, have need of *renewal;* neither is it subject to disestablishment, and so cannot require re-establishing.

But, says Mr. George, "did ever any one contend that immortality was the only attribute of soul?" He seems to entirely overlook the fact that the writer whom he quotes does not intimate that any one "did ever" so contend: he is not speaking so much about what attributes are claimed for the theological soul, as of the nature of the attribute immortality.

Dr. Lange says: "The outward man is an expression found only in this place, and it denotes the whole personal existence, so far as it is embodied in nature and the laws of the external common life. On the other hand, *our inward* (*man*), denotes the *same* personal existence, so far as it is determined by the Divine law,

and participates in the fulness of the Divine life. . . . The doctrine of Collenbusch and Menken, that the inner man is an invisible body, existing in some concealed form within us, cannot be sustained by any natural exegesis, or by the plain meaning of the words."

Theologists generally agree, substantially, with Collenbusch and Menken, for our confident author but expresses a common sentiment when he claims that the theological soul-entity is the *man,* and only resides in a clay tenement which, when the soul leaves it, is only the *remains* of a *man.* Such a doctrine, we affirm, in the language of Dr. Lange, "cannot be sustained by any natural exegesis, or by the plain meaning" of Scripture "words." Meyer thinks *outward man* denotes "that which is visible in us, *i. e.,* our corporeal nature, and *inward* (*man*) our intellectual, rational and moral selves."

We feel quite safe in saying Paul's inward man was his *mind.* "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man."—Rom. vii. 22. There can be no question, we think, that the apostle here uses *inward man* for his mind. That this is so he plainly enough indicates in verse 23: "But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law which is in my members." Paul delighted in "the law of God," his mind, reason and judgment, approving it and causing him to take pleasure in its practice. But the law of the members, the appetites and passions, forming a kind of another self, was continually waging war with the better self, and brought the reason somewhat into captivity to the inferior powers. Paul's whole meaning is still further indicated in ver. 25 of chap. vii.: "So then, with the mind

I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." What can be plainer than that Paul's "inward man" was the mind, and his "outward man" the flesh, with its members.

Dr. Adam Clarke, writing on Rom. vii. 22, quotes as follows from one whom he characterizes as a "pious and sensible writer:" "The *inward man* always signifies the mind; which either may, or may not, be the subject of grace." It is so plain that *inward man* means the mind, we think he must be straitened indeed, who will go to 2 Cor. iv. 16 for proof of the doctrine of inherent immortality.

CHAPTER VI.

PART I.

"According to my earnest expectation and my hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness, as always, so now also, Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life, or by death. For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better. Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you."—Phil. i. 20–24.

OF this language of Paul Mr. George remarks, p. 55 of his book, as follows:

"Every honest reader of the Bible will see at a glance that the contrast is between living 'in the flesh' (ver. 22); abiding 'in the flesh' (ver. 24), on the one hand, and *departing 'to be with Christ,'* on the other. To establish this needs no argument, as the passage is before the reader. Paul is divided in his feeling, having two objects before him, which seem to stand opposed

to each other; namely, his own happiness and the well-being of his brethren. For his own sake, he desires to die and depart; to be with Christ."

We have long been of the opinion that the most reasonable and natural exposition of the text is that which makes the contrast "between living in the flesh, abiding in the flesh, on the one hand, and *departing* to be with Christ, on the other:" but we are entirely unwilling to say that "every honest reader of the Bible will see at a glance" that such is the case, for there are hosts of *honest* readers of the Bible who do not see it. Our confident author himself seems to fail to see it long enough to write a single paragraph. Before he has written ten lines he bids adieu to the explication which he affirms "every honest reader of the Bible will see at a glance," and says of Paul, "For his own sake, he desires to *die* and depart." He forgets that when people *die* they do not go to Christ, but are generally put in the grave. If Paul desired to *die* he would hardly have said, "yet what I shall choose" (*choose*, in the sense of selecting with a view to possession, cannot properly represent the expression of Paul, for the right of *choice*, in that sense, did not rest with him. What Paul would *prefer*) "I wot (know) not," for had he *desired* death he would most assuredly have *preferred* it; but so far from this he expressed a difficulty in concluding which he would prefer.

Claiming that Paul possessed a deathless soul which was the real man, it is assumed that the "I," spoken of as being "in the flesh," was Paul's immortal soul-entity; and then it is immediately said that *he, Paul*, the same "I," desired "to die." Think of it, dear reader: an un

dying, a deathless soul desiring to *die!* This is a strangely illogical and inconsistent way of complicating matters; but then, the theory compels it.

What did Paul mean by *in the flesh?* Why, in a state of mortality, of course. When he said "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," what did he mean? Was it that there will be no material bodies in the kingdom of God? None, we think, will assert it. He meant that there will be no natural, mortal, corruptible bodies there, for all subjects of the resurrection will "put on immortality," be raised *spiritual* bodies.

"According to my earnest expectation and my hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness as always, so now also, Christ shall be magnified in my body (me), whether it be by life, or by death. For me to live is Christ." (Christ what? Why, Christ magnified, for Paul says Christ shall be magnified by his life,) "and to die is gain." (Gain to Paul? No, not necessarily, though in some respects death must have been looked upon by him as gain to himself. Gain to Christ: Paul says Christ shall be magnified by his death; and in that respect Paul's death would be gain to Christ.) "But if I live in the flesh" (this state of mortality) "this" (Christ magnified) "is the fruit of my labor; yet what I shall choose I wot" (know) "not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better."

Paul was in a strait betwixt two; and the fact that he did not know how to make choice between them is pretty good evidence that he did not believe in going to glory at death; as, had he done so, he could quickly have decided the matter. His "desire to depart, and to

be with Christ" could not, therefore, have been one of the straits betwixt which he was.

Speaking of a time when he and his brethren were terribly persecuted in Asia, "pressed out of measure above strength, insomuch that" they "despaired even of life," Paul says: "We had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead: who delivered us from so great a death, and dost deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us." Thus it is seen that when death stared Paul in the face he had no desire to meet it, but if it were the Lord's will that he should then suffer it, his trust was not that he, or any part of him, should be glorified in death, but that he should be raised from the dead to eternal glory.

Again says Paul, Phil. ii. 27: "For indeed he" (Epaphroditus) "was sick nigh unto death; but God had mercy on him." Epaphroditus was Paul's fellow soldier and companion in labor. Sickness had stricken him down, and it is proper to infer from the language used, that his physical sufferings were equal unto death itself. Would it, then, have been an act of mercy on the part of God to have restored his servant to a life fraught with all the sorrows resulting from great persecution instead of instantly relieving him from all his trials by transferring him right to glory, if taking saints there at death is a part of God's plan? Our theory enables us to readily perceive why Paul regarded the restoration of Epaphroditus to health, as an act of mercy upon both of them, while those occupying the, so-called, orthodox stand-point must, we think, recognize an utter inability, on the part of any, to conceive how either

Paul or Epaphroditus could see in it the bestowal of any mercy upon the latter.

The two straits we conceive to be *life* and *death*. Paul plainly stated that in either case it would be gain to Christ, inasmuch as he (Christ) was to be magnified.

Paul always represented *death* as undesirable; and subjected, as he was, to sore trials and afflictions, persecuted on all sides, oftimes suffering more than death, daily; deserted and harassed by many from whom he had reason to expect the most faithful co-operation and enduring love, he could not look upon *life* as desirable; so, neither of the two being desirable, he knew not which to choose (prefer), for he *desired*, though he did not, perhaps, expect, a third and very much better thing than either of the two, which was to "depart," by translation, "and to be with Christ."

Translation being preferable to either life or death, there was nothing strange or unnatural in Paul's desiring it. There are times when all God's faithful ones thus feel. They would hail with joy unspeakable the coming of our dearly loved Redeemer, to relieve us from the fetters of mortality, and instantaneously change us from a natural, or animal to a spiritual existence. Paul tells us, "the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall *rise* first: *then* we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and *so* shall we ever be with the Lord." That will be "translation" to all saints who are then alive.

Belsham writes:

"It is commonly inferred from this text, and with

some appearance of plausibility, that the apostle expected to be introduced into a state of activity and happiness immediately after death; but this conclusion is inconsistent with his doctrine in the epistles to the Corinthians and the Thessalonians, where he represents the happiness of a future life as entirely dependent upon a resurrection from the dead; without which he assures them that their faith is vain, and all who had fallen asleep in Christ had perished. 1 Thess. iv. 13, 14; 1 Cor. xv. 12–18. To make the apostle, therefore, consistent with himself, we must understand him as comparing the present state with that which will take place immediately after the resurrection, and accounting as nothing the intervening lapse of time. Not, indeed, upon the metaphysical, however just, supposition, that the interval of thousands of ages is in reality nothing; but, because the apostle, and all the Christians in that age, believed that the second appearance of Christ to raise the dead, and judge the world, would take place in the course of a very few years, so that some who were then living would be witnesses to that awful event. It is upon this ground that he regarded as nothing the few years which he supposed would elapse before the resurrection of the dead. See 1 Thess. iv. 15."

Dr. Priestly remarks:

"Nothing can be inferred from this text in favor of an intermediate state between death and the resurrection. For the apostle, considering his own situation, would naturally connect the end of this life with the commencement of another and a better, as he would have no perception of any interval between them. That the apostle had no view to any state short of the coming of Christ to judgment, is evident from the phrase he makes use of, viz., being with Christ, which can only take place at his second coming. For Christ himself has said that he would come again, and that he would

take his disciples to himself; which clearly implies that they were not to be with him before that time.

Accordingly, for many centuries after the notion of an intermediate state was advanced, a notion which was the foundation of the doctrine of purgatory, and many other absurd and mischievous opinions and practices in the church of Rome, and of no good whatever, it was never imagined that departed souls were to be with Christ, but only in a place under ground called Hades, where they were to wait till the resurrection of their bodies, at which time, and not before, it was supposed that they would be with Christ. The opinion, of the soul going immediately to heaven, was not advanced with any degree of confidence by any Christians except the Gnostics, who believed in no resurrection at all, till about a thousand years after Christ."

Says the venerable Bishop Law, "The Scriptures, in speaking of the connection between our present and our future being, doth not take into the account our intermediate state in death, no more than we, in describing the course of any man's actions, take in the time he sleeps. Therefore the Scripture must affirm an immediate connection between death and judgment, Heb. ix. 28, and represent the coming of Christ as near at hand, James v. 8, 9."—*Law's Inquiry, App. No. xiii. xiv.* Milton says of the words *to be with Christ:*

"That is, at his appearing, which all the believers hoped and expected was then at hand. In the same manner one who is going on a voyage desires to set sail and to arrive at a destined port, such is the order in which his wishes arrange themselves, omitting all notice of the intermediate passage. If, however, it be true that there is no time without motion, which Aristotle illustrates by the example of those who were fabled to have slept in the temple of the heroes, and who, on

awaking, imagined that the moment in which they woke had succeeded without an interval to that in which they fell asleep; how much more must intervening time be annihilated to the departed (for, the dead,) so that to them, to die and to be with Christ will seem to take place at the same moment? Christ himself, however, expressly indicates the time at which we shall be with him; John xiv. 3, 'if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.'"

Archbishop Whately says some perhaps have found a difficulty in reconciling the expressions of Paul, 1 Thess. iv. 13, where he speaks of "them which are asleep;" and ver. 14, "them which sleep in Jesus," with Phil. i. 23, and he then remarks that they may be reconciled together on the supposition of a state of sleep between death and the resurrection. He further says:

"If a man were seemingly at the point of death in some painful disease, and were asked what he thought of *his own* prospects, he would be likely to answer, 'I long to be released from my sufferings, and to be with Christ;' for I believe that, to my own perception, the instant death closes my eyes, I shall be awakened by the last trump—the summons to meet my Lord. And though, in relation to *you the survivors*, my dying this hour or a year hence makes no difference as to the time when that day shall arrive, to *me* it makes all the difference: . . . relatively to *me*, it does, to all practical purposes, come the sooner, the sooner I am released from the burden of 'this earthly tabernacle.' . . . It is thus then that the apostle Paul, or any other sincere Christian *would* express himself, supposing him to have such a belief. And just thus it is that Paul *does* express himself. When he is administering comfort to the survivors respecting their brethren who have departed in

the Lord, he always speaks of them as 'asleep.' . . . On the other hand, when he speaks of his eager longing 'to depart and to be' (it is the substantive verb, to exist,) 'with Christ,' he is speaking of himself, solely, without any reference to the perceptions and feelings of the survivors, but only to his own. Now in respect to his own perceptions, the moment of his breathing his last in this world would be, as has been said, instantly succeeded (on the supposition of total insensibility during the interval) by that of his awakening in the presence of his Lord."

Thus we see that these learned men, these master-minds do not find the doctrine of *soul survivance in death* taught in the passage under consideration. No Christian person will even intimate that they were not *honest readers* of the Bible. We trust all those who have not yet done so will soon realize that wisdom will not be likely to die with the man who is thus reckless in statement. Paul was not inconsistent with himself; and we shall ere long see that his teachings not only give no countenance to the theory of inherent immortality but positively forbid faith in it.

That Paul, by the expression, "having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ," meant that he desired to *die* is a truly singular position for those to take who, believing that Christ now sits at the right hand of God in heaven, affirm that Paul's soul, together with other disembodied ones, is in *hades,* and so cannot be with Christ until the resurrection. It involves either, first: that Paul was ignorant of what would be his condition immediately after death; or, second: that God's throne is located in *hades;* or, third: that Paul did not believe that he would go to Christ when he died. They

can take their choice of these positions, the first and second of which are, so far as we know, equally absurd, and certainly at variance with the testimony of inspiration. As the third is *doubtless true*, it being in harmony with the Word, we are free to recommend it.

Part II.

"I knew a man in Christ about fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth:) such an one caught up to the third heaven." —2 Cor. xii. 2.

In order to press this text into the service of their theory, advocates of inherent immortality assume that Paul is not talking in verse 2 of what he directs attention to in verse 1. This assumption, we are free to affirm, is equally bold and unwarrantable. Says the Apostle, verse 1, "I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord." Of the expression, *I will come to visions*, Dr. Adam Clarke remarks: "Symbolical representations of spiritual and celestial things; in which matters of the deepest importance are exhibited to the *eye of the mind*."

Paul gives account of a certain item of his experience, as follows: "And it came to pass, that when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance."—Acts xxii. 17. It is, of course, impossible to say with certainty whether this is the occurrence of which Paul speaks in his second epistle to the Corinthians, but we deem it quite reasonable to suppose such is the case, for there is evidence that he was in Jerusalem about the time that he says he had the vision and revelation.

It is generally believed that the second epistle to Corinth was written A. D. 57. Fourteen years back (I knew a man in Christ about fourteen years ago) would be A. D. 43, just about the time that Paul and Barnabas were sent from Antioch as bearers of "relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea." Thus it is not improbable that the vision which he had in the temple, while in trance state, is that to which he refers. This opinion was entertained by Dr. Benson, Dr. Adam Clarke, and Dr. Priestly, the last of whom remarks: "Paul did not know whether he was carried up into the third heaven, or whether it was only a vision. That it was a vision, is much the most probable."

Rev. Thomas Belsham, in his notes on the epistles of Paul, writes thus:

"Here we may observe, that though through modesty the apostle conceals his name, yet it is plain from the connexion, that he could mean no one but himself who was thus highly favored. And further, that the whole was probably a visionary scene; and that by the expression, *in the body or out of the body*, he does not mean to decide any thing concerning the metaphysical nature of the soul, and a state of intermediate existence, but merely to say, that the expression was so vivid that he could not ascertain whether it was a real fact, or a scenic representation supernaturally exhibited to his mind. We may be well satisfied that it was the latter; because there is no such place as that which the gross philosophy of the Jews called the third heaven.... Paul imagined himself transported into the third heaven; but this no more proves the existence of such a place, than the representations impressed upon the imagination of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and John, are proofs of the real external existence of those places which they saw in vision.

Paul saw and heard what he was either not permitted, or not able, to describe. It is therefore vain and useless to form any conjecture upon the subject. There can be no doubt that it answered the purpose intended, of strengthening the apostle's mind, extending his views, confirming his faith, and improving his qualifications for his apostolic office."

Mr. George affirms of the passage under consideration: "This clearly teaches that there is a conscious entity which can exist *in* the body or *out* of the body." In contrast to this assertion we quote from Dr. Clarke, who says: "That the apostle was in an ecstacy or *trance*, something like that of Peter, Acts x. 10, there is reason to believe; but we know that, being carried *literally* into heaven, was possible to the Almighty. But as he could not decide himself, it would be ridiculous in us to attempt it." We agree with the Dr., though we should hardly have felt willing to speak so plainly concerning the affirmation noted. That it is possible to the Almighty to carry people literally to heaven, the experience of Enoch, of Elijah, and of our Saviour fully attest. Peter also "fell into a trance, and saw heaven opened." Did a spirit-entity leave the body, and go to heaven and see it open? Certainly not; but he saw in the trance vision "a certain vessel *descending* unto him."

"And it came to pass . . . as I sat in mine house, and the elders of Judah sat before me, that the hand of the Lord God fell upon me. And he put forth the form of an hand, and took me by a lock of mine head; and the Spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem." —Ezek. viii. 1–3. The prophet was not taken bodily to

Jerusalem, for he was all the while with "the elders of Judah," who sat before him. Was a spirit-entity separated from him and taken to Jerusalem? Not unless it had a literal head, with literal locks upon it, for "he put forth the form of an hand, and took me by a lock of mine head." All will at once see that Ezekiel simply had a *vision,* an experience shared by Peter, by Paul, and still later by John, on Patmos; and any one of the instances teaches that man possesses an entity capable of conscious existence separately from the body, equally with either of the others, which is precisely not at all.

If, as is affirmed, Paul had such an entity, or, which is a more consistent way of stating it, Paul *was* such an entity, then when he was out of the body the body must have been dead, for physical death, it is claimed, consists in the separation of soul and body. From this conclusion, ridiculous as it is, there is no escape. An English writer, endeavoring to shun the dilemma, produces the following:

"We may conceive the soul to receive a supernatural vision, either while it remaineth still in the body, or by its departing from the body for a season. The latter may not be called death, because either the sensitive, or at least the *vegetative,* soul or faculty continues meanwhile in the body, either naturally or miraculously vivifying it."

So, then, man, as beheld in every-day life, consists of three distinct parts, viz., a body and two souls, one of these latter being the essential and ruling party, while the other is a lower, a sort of grovelling, "vegetative" fellow, a part of whose business it is to stay at home and keep house, having every thing snug and warm

for the return of the master-spirit. Lange's Commentary, in which the above singular language is not altogether unapprovingly quoted, sometimes favors a somewhat similar style of reasoning, and takes nearly the same ground. There is so much in the position which reminds one of its heathen origin, it cannot be thought eminently calculated to deceive.

If our friends on the other side of the question *will* have error in preference to truth, we have no special objection to their enjoying whatever of comfort can be derived from such philosophy, but we cannot hold them quite justifiable or even unblameworthy in deceiving the unthoughtful by pretending to find it in the word of God. We *do* object to the practice indulged by many theologians, of adopting certain conclusions of a false philosophy and, taking advantage of the credulity of the ignorant, imposing those conclusions upon their fellow-beings as Scriptural truth.

What Mr. Lee remarks on the subject of inspiration, we conceive to have been the experience of Paul on the occasion to which he refers. Lee says: "The infusion of spiritual influences supersedes at the same time the usual succession of ideas and the ordinary current of thought; the power of imagination alone remaining active, and the sense of spiritual vision being excited to the highest degree of intensity." We are justified in the confidence that they who think 2 Cor. xii 2 affords any evidence of inherent immortality are supported in the opinion by few indeed among the thinkers of even the spirit-entity faith. They must go to heathen philosophy, the origin of the theory, for proof to sustain it: the Bible does not teach that kind of immortality. The

"life and immortality" which it brings to light comes by a resurrection from the dead, through Jesus Christ.

Part III.

"Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."—John v. 28, 29.

We will not dwell at any length on this text, what we conceive to be the meaning of it not being in the range of our present purpose; for whatever the language may be thought to import, it will not be regarded by any reasonable or logical mind as affording even a hint that the wicked will not be *destroyed*, "annihilated."

Every reader of the work under review must recognize this peculiar and unhappy feature, that whenever the author is unable to produce argument having the semblance of effectiveness, he is pretty sure to immediately set to work denouncing some one. We have heretofore noted some of the numerous instances of this unreasonable, unfortunate and unchristian procedure, and now we are again pained at meeting with the following concerning "Mr. Storrs, who," he affirms, "from long experience is well skilled in twisting, combining, misapplying . . . to say nothing of other resorts," etc. He says of the same writer, that he "attacks all Scripture which stands in his way, and breaks them down, no matter how." Charging upon others a desire to "murder" texts is also a seemingly favorite pastime with our ardent author.

If we desired *only* the triumph of truth we would rejoice in such displays of creaturely effusion, and would

wish that all opponents might adopt the same style of defending error, for we hold that no humble, consistent and honored defender of truth is ever so secure in the exercise of his influence for good as when thus assailed; but to see reproach thus carelessly brought upon the blessed cause of Christ is saddening and humiliating, and it would be disheartening as well, did not faith as sure us that the Lord will overrule all and amply protect his work.

To the attention of those who accept the text under consideration as teaching the popular view, we commend the following: "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the *children of God*, being the *children of the resurrection*."—Luke xx. 35, 36. This text admits of *no* explication which makes the subjects of the resurrection other than just what Jesus positively declares they will be viz., "children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

Our Saviour did not contradict himself, and hence if it be insisted that *all* the dead will live again it must also be insisted that Universalism is true, or else deny the plainest possible declarations of Christ. Which will they do? The reply of Jesus to the Sadducees is in perfect harmony with all other well understood Scripture testimony; while the popular interpretation of John v. 28, 29 cannot be harmonized with other Scripture. We used to think, sometimes, that certain texts of Scripture were about to be *broken down*, but when the smoke of controversy had cleared away, we found the

texts not only safe and sound but brighter than ever, and pouring out their rich treasures of Divine light; but our *expositions* of them were *broken down*, yet, total wreck that they were, we rejoiced in their downfall because that downfall was our freedom.

We cannot close these remarks without calling the reader's attention to the very great improbability of ignorance on the part of the author of "Annihilationism not of the Bible," of the fact that the writer of whom he so unbecomingly speaks, prayerfully seeks to "bring out the meaning" of Scripture texts, and in doing so has no conflict with any theory which he does not conceive to be in conflict with the word of God. He may err, and he makes no pretensions to infallibilty, but he *desires* the triumph of truth, whatever human theories are overthrown. Having only feelings of tenderness and love toward all followers of Jesus, we are constrained to suggest to N. D. George the wisdom of henceforth refraining not only from all such unreasonable and false charges, but from *all* charges of like character, for God will yet judge between him and those fellow-servants whom he thus smites.

CHAPTER VII.

Part 1.

"And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias, talking with him."—Matt. xvii. 1–3. (See also Mark ix. 2–4; Luke ix. 28, 30).

These texts, like many others that have no reference whatever to the subject, and hence cannot, without doing violence to principles of sound reason, be thought to favor the idea of consciousness in death, are not unfrequently urged in support of that theory. As Elijah did not die, but was carried bodily up from the earth into heaven, we may fairly suppose, it will not be contended by any that his participation in the scene of transfiguration affords, even by the remotest implication, the slightest evidence of conscious survivance in death.

With Moses, however, the case is somewhat different, for he died and was buried. To those, therefore, who base their explication of the text upon the assumption that an entity in man (an entity which constitutes, it is held, the *real man*) exists as a living, responsible being while the material organization is dead, the circumstance of Moses' presence at the transfiguration *seems* somewhat indicative that a soul-entity survives the death of what is termed the body. These should not fail to consider the fact that this mode of approaching any passage of Scripture, while it *may* result in strengthening their existing convictions, must of necessity work

them positive injury if their convictions happen to be erroneous. Mr. George remarks:

"That the soul survives the body is evinced by the fact that Moses was alive in the time of the Saviour, although his body had been dead more than fourteen hundred years."—p. 127.

The reader will perceive the pointed distinction here between *Moses* and *his body*. *Moses* was alive "although *his body* had been dead more than fourteen hundred years." This is consistent with the popular theory, which makes the material organization no part of the man proper, the *man* being an assumed immortal part, called the soul; but we will show that it is *not* consistent as well with the testimony of inspiration, but is directly opposed thereto. It must not be forgotten that our "Rev." author and his coadjutors insist that an immaterial soul was *Moses himself*, all else being merely his body, a mere tenement, its life and sense depending upon the presence of the soul.

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Get thee up into this mount Abiram, and see the land which I give unto the children of Israel. And when thou hast seen it, thou also shalt be gathered unto thy people, as Aaron thy brother was gathered."—Num. xxvii. 12, 13. How was Aaron gathered unto his people? "And Aaron shall be gathered unto his people, and shall *die* there. . . . And Aaron *died* there in the top of the mount. . . . And when all the congregation saw that Aaron was *dead*, they mourned for Aaron thirty days."—Num. xx. 26, 28, 29. Moses himself said: "But I must *die* in this land, I must not go over Jordan."—Deut. iv. 22.

"So Moses the servant of the Lord *died* there in

the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord . . . And Moses was an hundred and thirty years old when *he died:* his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated."—Deut. xxxiv. 5, 7. God afterward said unto Joshua, "Moses my servant is dead." If an immaterial entity constituted the intelligent, responsible Moses, then that entity must unquestionably have been that which served God, and hence was said to be "the servant of the Lord." This conclusion is positively unavoidable; but it is said, "Moses *the servant* of the Lord died." Therefore, arguing from their own chosen premise, our friends of the inherent immortality faith must of necessity admit, if at all consistent, that their soul-entity Moses *died.* Then again: why should it be said of this soul-entity Moses, that "his eye was not dim," if he was immortal and consequently had eyes which could not grow dim? And why the expression, "nor his natural force abated?" Is such a spiritual and immaterial entity as a soul is said to be, possessed of *natural* force, which may abate? How many are the gross absurdities into which the theory inevitably leads. How unfortunate for such a position is it that inspiration did not say it was only the "body" of Moses that died, instead of again and again declaring it was Moses himself. Notwithstanding the word of God so plainly declares that *Moses died* and was *buried,* Mr. George and others affirm he did *not* die, and was *not* buried. What an awful responsibility do they assume who thus speak against God. May they yet see their error, and repent of it.

But the question arises, why was not Moses permitted to enter the promised inheritance? In answering this

we shall see that other insuperable objections to the theory we are considering present themselves. The Lord said to Moses: "Get thee up into this mountain Abiram, unto mount Nebo, which is in the land of Moab, that is over against Jericho; and behold the land of Canaan . . . and *die* in the mount whither thou goest up, and be gathered unto thy people; as Aaron thy brother died in mount Hor, and was gathered unto his people: Because ye trespassed against me among the children of Israel at the waters of Meribah-Kadesh, in the wilderness of Zin."—Deut. xxxii. 49, 50, 51. Moses gives the following account of an interview with God: "O Lord God, thou hast begun to show thy servant thy greatness, and thy mighty hand: for what God is there in heaven or in earth that can do according to thy works, and according to thy might? I pray thee, let me go over, and see the good land that is beyond Jordan, that goodly mountain, and Lebanon. But the Lord was wroth with me for your sakes, and would not hear me: and the Lord said unto me, Let it suffice thee: speak no more unto me of this matter."—Deut. iii. 24, 25, 26. See also Psa. cvi. 32, 33.

Thus we see it was in *punishment for transgression* that Moses died without entering the promised land: it was "because" he "trespassed against" the Lord "among the children of Israel at the waters of Meribah Kadesh." The popular theory not only denies that Moses *died*, but it would have us believe that God took him to heaven in punishment for transgression. Was old Canaan so much more delightful than is heaven that it was a real punishment to Moses to keep him out of the one by taking him to the other?

On the other hand, if the heaven to which latter-day theology sends soul-entities immediately at the death of what is called "the body" be far more glorious than any part of earth can be, why did Moses, if he believed in going there at death, pray so fervently to be permitted to cross over to and live in Canaan?

To suppose the chosen leader of Israel capable of such pleading for permission to remain longer out of a place of unalloyed happiness is to suspect him of the greatest folly. If the prophet and leader had plead Israel's need of his longer presence with them the case would be quite different, but he does not intimate any ground for his desire to enter the inheritance other than the pleasure it would afford him, and, of course, the longer life which the granting of his prayer would involve.

No Scripture truth can be better established than that Moses himself (not his body merely, as is so confidently asserted) *died*. What, then, follows as an inevitable conclusion? Why, that if he was present at the transfiguration he was first raised from the dead; and hence his appearance upon that occasion cannot be considered as affording the faintest indication that *any part* of man, much less the man himself, exists in a conscious state between death and the resurrection.

It is objected to the spirit-entity theory, that, "if only Moses' immaterial soul was there it could not be seen by mortal eyes." In reply to this it is urged that "separate spirits" can be invested with form, and thus "present themselves to material eyes." Since it would have required quite as great display of omnipotent power to furnish the immaterial Moses with a temporary

form in precise likeness to the natural as it did to raise him from the dead, we cannot keenly appreciate the decided preference of our opponents for the supposition that the former miracle was wrought, and especially as the Moses who appeared was the Moses whom inspiration declares died; nor can we account for the existence of that preference in any other way than that they fully recognize the fact that the admission of the resurrection of Moses would be an acknowledgment that the text in no wise favors their theory. That they should first prove an existence of immaterial soul-entities which may be invested with form, and thus "present themselves to mortal eyes," is an obligation which they persistently ignore, obvious though it is. Why is this? Simply because such an existence is not susceptible of proof, it having nothing more substantial and reliable than bare assumption to support it. If a thing is revealed in the word of God it *need not* be assumed; if not thus revealed, it *should not* be assumed. To all, then, we would say, "be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you." How immeasurably would christendom be advantaged if men were as energetic in search for truth as they are in defence of error.

Dr. Adam Clarke, speaking of the transfiguration, in connection with the resurrection of the dead and changing of those who are alive at the coming of Christ, says:

"He probably gave the full representation of this in the person of Moses, who *died*, and was thus raised to life, (or appeared as he shall appear when raised from the dead at the last day;) and in the person of Elijah,

who never *tasted death.* Both their bodies exhibit the same appearance, to show, that the bodies of glorified saints are the same, whether the person had been translated, or whether he had died."

Prof. Mattison, a learned Methodist, once published a work entitled *Spirit Rappings Unveiled,* in which, in connection with a statement of what he "supposed" to have occasioned "the 'dispute' between Michael the archangel and satan 'about the body of Moses," spoken of by Jude, he remarks:

"If this explanation is correct, (and to say the least, it is highly probable,) it affords much ground for the belief that God has settled the 'dispute' by raising the body of Moses from the dead, and that he appeared on the Mount of transfiguration precisely as Elias appeared."

The command of Jesus, "Tell the *vision* to no man till the Son of man be risen from the dead," suggests the possibility, perhaps probability, that the prophet and the law-giver were not personally present at the transfiguration, but were *represented.* As Christ was declared to be "the first-born from the dead" (to an incorruptible life) "that in all things he might have the pre-eminence," Col. i. 18, "the first-fruit of them that slept," 1 Cor. xv. 20, we are forced to the conclusion that if Moses was raised from the dead it was only temporarily. That the transaction was a *vision,* an *appearance,* is regarded as quite probable by Dr. Clarke, who thinks that Moses was either raised to life "or *appeared* now as he shall appear *when raised* from the dead at the last day."

If Moses and Elijah were personally present, we may reasonably conclude that as the "Law and the Prophets" were connected, and as Christ was "the end of the

law," the *law* in the person of Moses, the legislator; and the prophets, represented by Elijah, were brought together to formally render up their authority unto the Messiah. This seems to be rendered the more reasonable by Luke's account, chap. ix. 31, that the three talked of "his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem."

The soul-entity theory derives no support whatever from the account of the transfiguration in any just exposition. On the contrary it may properly be held to oppose it.

Part II.

"But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed they had seen a spirit."—Luke xxiv. 37.

In Matt. xiv. 26, "they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit," the word is *phantasma;* and Griesbach, a very excellent authority, has given the same word in this passage. *Phantasma,* or a phantasm is described by Webster as, "an image formed by the mind, and supposed to be real; an imaginary existence which seems to be real; a shadowy or airy appearance; sometimes an optical illusion." All will at once see that the text cannot with reason or consistency be claimed as affording evidence of a separate conscious existence of any part of man when the other part is dead, and hence to multiply words in elucidation of what is already sufficiently clear would be a waste of time and effort.

It is said the soul or spirit is "*immaterial, uncompounded, indivisible.* To claim, therefore, that the apostles were affrighted because they thought they saw an existence the very nature of which, a fact they would not

have been unaware of, precludes its being seen, is to urge that they were to some extent subjects of dementation. Until popular theology gives to the world a new definition or description of its fancied spirit-entity it can lay no claim to this text, unless, indeed, it is willing to admit that the spirit-entity idea is a phantasm.

Part III.

"Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For God is not the God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him."—Luke xx. 37, 38.

Were we not well aware of the extent to which many expositors and others indulge the habit of severing passages of Scripture from their connections, and arraying them in seeming support of certain dogmas, we would never cease to wonder how it is that not a few men of intelligence and thought conceive that the above words of Jesus afford evidence of man's immortality. Quoting, with entire approval, from Mr. Landis, it is said, p. 137 of the work under review:

"The Sadducees believed that man ceased utterly to exist at death, and, consequently, they denied his resurrection."

This statement is, of course, framed to strengthen an exposition, but, as all must see, it is put wrong end foremost. Had it been said, the Sadducees denied a resurrection, and, consequently, they consistently believed that man ceased utterly to exist at death, the assertion would have possessed the very attractive and exalted merit of truthfulness, and would have commended itself to the judgment of every thoughtful person. Again:

"But he" (Jesus) "aimed at something more: for,

had he simply proved a future resurrection, the Sadducees would still have objected that there was no such thing as a spirit; while, if the existence of the spirit after death is proved, the resurrection, as they viewed the matter, followed of course. Our Saviour, therefore, in order to disprove their views on both of these points, refers to Exod. iii. 6, 16, which affirms that God was still the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, though they had been long dead; and upon which he also remarks, that '*God is not the God of the dead*' . . . '*but of the living;*' and then, directly in the face of their theory, he adds, 'for all live unto him'; that is, so far is man from ceasing to exist at death, as ye Sadducees pretend, that, even though they have ceased to be seen on earth, all that are dead still live to him."

We think the reader will agree with us in the opinion that should a man set to work to do his utmost in that direction, he could scarcely hope to succeed in crowding into a few sentences so much of sophistry, and so many mistatements and contradictions, mingled with *some* truth apparently unmeaningly uttered, as is contained in the foregoing extract. Mr. George distinctly affirms, and he repeatedly reasons upon the assumption, that man does not die, only something connected with him, which, when *the man* leaves it, is "only the remains" of a man. He urges, moreover, that Jesus so taught. In accordance with this position, it is insisted that our Saviour, by way of proving a resurrection, a reliving again of dead persons, substantially said to the Sadducees, "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are not dead, as ye suppose, but are still living, therefore they will be raised from the dead." Profound logic! a kind, however, for which Messrs. Landis and George will not, we venture to say, receive the thanks of the more consistent members

of their school. He must be firmly wedded indeed to a theory, and determined to sustain it at all hazards, who will deliberately attribute to our blessed Saviour such a style of reasoning.

Suppose Jesus *had* told the Sadducees that man possesses an undying spirit-entity: they would, most likely, still have replied, "well, that can be no proof of a resurrection, for if those spirit-entities exist now in a separate state why may they not always so exist? Their existence cannot prove that there will be a resurrection of the dead. If what thou sayest, that 'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him,' proves that some part of man is alive when the other part is *dead*, then our doctrine, that the *dead* will not live again, is established, for God, not being the God of the *dead*, will not raise them up again." A child can easily see that the argument imputed to Jesus would be altogether likely to confirm the Sadducees in their belief rather than convince them of their error, for to affirm, as is done, that the language, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," proves that some part of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob did *not* die, is 'to deny that so much of those patriarchs as *did* die' will ever live again. Thus the resurrection, the very doctrine which Jesus undertook to prove, and did prove, is denied.

Look at this:

"If the existence of the spirit after death is proved, the resurrection, as they viewed the matter, followed of course."

Followed of course! Let Mr. George go to some of the hundreds of thousands of professing Christians of to-day, who believe in the immortality of the soul, but who

deny a resurrection of the dead simply *because* they believe man possesses an immortal entity, and he will quickly learn whether or not it is seen that "the resurrection" follows as a matter "of course." If it follows as a matter of course, pray tell us why the inevitable tendency of belief in it to *denial* of a resurrection? The Gnostics were the only Christians in the early days of the church, we believe, who, as a body, held to the immortality of the soul, and they, like many in the present day, not seeing any necessity for a resurrection, the *real man* being better off in the fancied disembodied state, denied the resurrection of dead persons.

Does it, then, follow "of course?" Not so thought Justyn Martyr, who said: "If, therefore, you fall in with certain men that are called Christians, who confess not this truth" (the resurrection) "but dare to blaspheme the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob; in that they say there is no resurrection of the dead, *but that* immediately when they die their souls are received up into heaven—avoid them and esteem them not Christians." Nor did so think Wm. Tyndale, the martyr, who, replying to a Platonist who attacked the doctrines of Luther, said: "In putting departed souls in heaven, hell, and purgatory, you *destroy* the *argument wherewith* Christ and Paul *prove* the resurrection." Darby, a so-called, orthodox writer, says: "It was just when the *coming of Christ was denied* in the church, or at least began to be lost sight of, that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul *came in to* REPLACE *that of the resurrection.*"

We assert that the tendency of belief in the conscious existence of a spirit-entity between death and resurrec-

tion is not only to *weaken* faith in the resurrection, but to *destroy* it altogether, a result it has accomplished in myriads of cases. Notwithstanding the doctrine of the resurrection was constantly insisted upon by the apostles and early fathers, comparatively few Christians of the present time attach any importance to it.

Why the change? Simply because men have learned to believe, in opposition to the plain testimony of inspiration, that a part of man (the *real man*) lives on at death, and, if holy, is unspeakably happy; and hence little or no *necessity* for a resurrection exists. He who holds that a belief in the idea of consciousness in death leads, as a matter "of course," to belief in a resurrection of the dead, has a theory which is opposed to palpable facts. But he may possibly say with another, "so much the worse for the facts." The doctrine of the immortality of the soul had its *origin* in the fact that men were seen to die, and turn to dust, and it not being seen how they could ever live again, and their identity be restored, it was concluded that a part of man *lived on.*

The truth is unwittingly uttered in the remarks that call attention to the reference of Jesus to certain Scripture "which affirms that God was still the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, though they had been *long dead,*" but the citation completely overthrows our author's own argument. He insists that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are *not dead.* Yes, the truth is plainly spoken when it is said that Jesus refers to Scripture "which affirms that God was still the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, though they had been *long dead.*"

The language, therefore, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him," must of

necessity have reference to something else than life in present actual possession. What is that something else? In what peculiar sense is God the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, though they have been *long dead?* And how does the fact that he is their God prove that they will be raised from the dead? We shall see.

Unto Abraham God made certain promises of a specific character (see Gen. xxii). These promises were substantially repeated to Isaac to whom it was said: "I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father" (see Gen. xxvi. 2, 5). Jehovah afterward renewed the promises to Jacob, prefacing them with this assurance: "I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac. . . . And, behold, I am with *thee*, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest" (see Gen. xxviii. 13–15). Thus we see that in order that these ancient worthies might *know* that the promises would be fulfilled, even though *they* might not be able to see *how* that fulfillment would or could be accomplished, the Lord announced himself their God.

This assurance was given to Moses also, as follows: "I am the God of thy fathers, and the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Why did God make this declaration to Moses? Doubtless to assure the prophet that the promises to his fathers were not forgotten, and though the patriarchs had died without seeing a fulfillment of them, they nevertheles would yet be fulfilled. Abraham, when as yet he and Sarah had no children, believed God would perform the promise of giving him a multitudinous seed: and when he went to offer up his only son, the child of promise, it was in

the full confidence that "God was able to raise him," (Isaac,) "up, even from the dead."

Well, were the promises made, for instance, to Abraham personally, fulfilled during his life-time? Let us see. Stephen, in his last address, declared: "Men, brethren and fathers, hearken; the God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran, and said unto him, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I shall show thee. Then came he out of the land of the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Charran: and from thence, when his father was dead, he removed him into this land, wherein ye now dwell. And he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on: yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession."—Acts vii. 2–5.

Now, what have we here? We have the undeniable fact that God promised Abraham a certain country for an inheritance, but never gave him, during his life-time, "so much as to set his foot on." What follows? Why, God being still his God, Abraham is, unto God, reckoned as alive, because he is to be *raised from the dead to receive the promised inheritance.* Thus it is that Moses showed the resurrection of the dead when he called God "the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob."

Paul declared concerning certain worthies, of whom were Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things,

declare plainly that they seek a country . . . Wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; for he hath prepared for them a city." Because of their faith and works of faith, "God is not ashamed to be called their God," and "he hath prepared for them a city." Have they received that which God hath prepared for them? No, in no wise, for if there was any thing about them which did not die it was not a subject of promise, because they to whom the promises were made "all died in faith:" and beside it is the "promised land" that they are to have for an inheritance. As, therefore, they *died* without having received what was promised them, and as God's promises are sure unto all whose God he remains to be, it follows, inevitably, that they will be raised from the dead.

The Sadducees were not ignorant concerning the promises of God to their fathers, and so when Jesus called their attention to the fact that those promises had not been fulfilled, they saw at once that in order to a fulfillment there must be a resurrection. They recognized the fact as an *unanswerable* argument, for "certain of the scribes, answering, said, Master, thou hast well said. And after that they durst not ask him any question at all." A more convincing and conclusive argument for the resurrection could not be produced, for to deny it when thus presented was to deny the stability of God's word.

We think no earnest seeker after truth will fail to see how it is that God is the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, though they have been long dead, or in what sense all, whose God he is, "live unto him."

One thought more. The expression "God is not the

God of the dead, but of the living" is incontrovertible evidence that they whose God he is *not*, are *dead* in that sense in which the patriarchs, whose God he *is*, are said to be *alive*. The reader will please note this point. If, therefore, the language proves that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are living and conscious at the present time, it must also prove that they whose God he is "ashamed to be called" are *dead* and *unconscious* at the present time. Thus the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, so far as it is thought to be favored by the texts under consideration, is demolished by the inexorable logic of the very argument adduced to sustain it. Let it go: it is a doctrine which will not bear the test of Scripture investigation.

To all who name the name of Christ we would say, strive to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, for thus you will be ever owned as God's children; and though you "go down into the valley of the shadow of death," you need "fear no evil," for God will continue to be your God, and hence will bring you forth, in fulfillment of his promise, to sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the everlasting kingdom of Christ.

Rest assured that God is still the God of *all* his people, "though they have been long dead," and *because* he is so he will, in his appointed time, give unto them an eternal triumph over death. Until the dawn of that glad day, let us all both diligently strive and patiently wait.

It is written, "He shall keep the feet of his saints:" He will be with them in all the places whithersoever they go, and will preserve them, so that none shall be lost. He

will not be "ashamed to be called their God, for he hath prepared for them a city." But what of those whose God he is "ashamed to be called?" "The wicked shall be *silent* in darkness." Then they will not be forever cursing and blaspheming against God and the whole host of heaven. No, no, they shall be "*silent*" in the "darkness" of the tomb. Wickedness shall cease, and evil shall be no more. O, that all who profess to serve God might earnestly and prayerfully consider these things, that so they might the more heartily and intelligently "sing praises to the Lord, and declare unto the people his doings."

CHAPTER VIII.

PART I.

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.—Luke xvi.

THERE are probably no texts in the Bible more confidently relied on or more frequently quoted by many as affording proof of the popular theory concerning man's nature and destiny, than are the last thirteen verses in the sixteenth chapter of "The GOSPEL according to ST. LUKE." As the author whose work we review has considerable to say of Mr. Storrs' exposition, being careful, the while, not to furnish his readers with any of that expositor's arguments, we will briefly supply the omission. Especially do we this because Mr. George, without frankly saying so, *seems* to regard this language of our Saviour in the light of literal history, and defends that principle of interpreting it.

"Those who maintain that it is a literal relation, have

no less difficulty in explaining it than their opponents: they cannot explain it all literally, and yet they are bound to do so to be consistent. Let them make the attempt. *Lazarus*, covered with sores, died and was carried into Abraham's *bosom*. Will they pretend that is literal? O, no, say they, it was Lazarus' *soul!* But our Lord says, Lazarus was carried into Abraham's bosom. Our opponents have to say—'Not so, Lord—it was his soul:' thus, they contradict our Lord to establish their own 'traditions.' Let us see whether they succeed any better with their real history of the rich man. He died. What became of him? He 'was buried:' the rich *man* was buried, remember. What next? 'In [*hades*, the grave, of course, where he was buried; improperly translated] *hell* he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom,' etc. The rich *man* did this. They say—It was his *soul:* but our Lord says, it was the rich man. Thus again they make void the words of Christ to establish their traditions, if our Lord did really give a 'literal history.' But for the sake of showing the folly of their tradition about the soul we will suppose it was Lazarus' and the rich man's souls or spirits, disembodied, that are in hades. We now ask —Are their disembodied souls or spirits material or immaterial? That is, are they matter, or not matter? We are answered—'They are immaterial.' If so, they have no substance! Can that which has no substance be seen or touched? If not, the 'literal history' advocates have an immaterial rich man, with immaterial eyes, looking afar off and seeing immaterial Lazarus, or no-substance Lazarus! Truly, these immaterial souls must have sharp eyes to see *nothing!* and an equally sharp understanding to know that it is Lazarus! But that is not all. The immaterial rich man desires that immaterial Lazarus should dip his immaterial finger in literal water and cool his immaterial tongue! And all

this is 'literal history!' We have not placed the subject in this absurd light with any other view than merely to show the 'literal history' advocates that they are, at least, as much involved in difficulty in explaining this Scripture as we, who believe it to be a parable, and that it has no reference to man's state in a future life.

"That it is a parable, the context shows. It is in a group of them, viz., the lost piece of silver—the lost sheep—the prodigal son, and the wasteful or 'unjust steward,' with an admonition against serving mammon, or riches. The Pharisees, who were covetous, heard all these things, and they derided him. Our Lord then proceeds in his discourse with special reference to the change about to take place in the dispensations. He says—'The law and the prophets were [preached] until John; since that time the Kingdom of God is preached,' etc."—*Watch Tower.*

We hold the language to be a parable. On no other principle of interpretation can it be explained without involving contradictions and absurdities too palpable to be disregarded. But it is insisted by some that even parables are founded in fact. Let us see if this is true.

"The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them; and they said unto the olive tree, Reign thou over us. But the olive tree said unto them, should I leave my fatness, wherewith by me they honor God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees? And the trees said to the fig tree, Come thou, and reign over us. But the fig tree said unto them, should I forsake my sweetness, and my fruit, and go to be promoted over the trees? Then said the trees unto the vine, Come thou, and reign over us," etc., etc.—Judges ix. 8–15.

Trees certainly are not in the habit of meeting together to choose and "anoint a king over them;" and

we do not think any reasonable person will take the ground that such an occurrence ever really took place. The account is a parable, and it illustrates some truth. Again:

"Son of man, put forth a riddle, and speak a parable unto the house of Israel; and say, Thus saith the Lord God, a great eagle with great wings, long winged, full of feathers, which had divers colors, came unto Lebanon, and took the highest branch of the cedar: He cropped off the top of his young twigs, and carried it into a land of traffic; he set it into a city of merchants. He took also of the seed of the land, and planted it in a fruitful field; he placed it by great waters, and set it as a willow tree. And it grew, and became a spreading vine of low stature, whose branches turned toward him. . . . There was also another great eagle with great wings and many feathers; and, behold, this vine did bend her roots toward him, and shot forth her branches toward him, that he might water it by the furrows of her plantation. It was planted in a good soil by great waters, that it might bring forth branches, and that it might bear fruit, that it might be a goodly vine."—Ezek. xvii. 2–8.

If this parable is founded in fact, the eagles spoken of must have possessed a very much higher degree of intelligence than theologians of the present day are willing to accord to any of the brute creation. The vine, too, which the eagle planted, grew with the view to accomplishing a certain object. None will claim that this parable is founded in fact. But our Rev. author says the Saviour's parables are all "founded upon facts." He then proceeds to show how they are "founded upon facts." "1. There are such men as rich men." Yes. "2. Rich men sometimes fare sumptuously." Quite

true. "3. That there are beggars." Certainly, quite a number. "4. That there are dogs." We confess to having seen some and heard of others. "5. That there is such a thing as death." The arch *enemy*, the king of terrors has reigned too long, and is at the present time too alarmingly active to have his existence denied. "6. That there are such beings as angels." The Scriptures so inform us. "7. That there is such a place as Hades, a place of departed spirits." The existence of hades we affirm, but, that it is "a place" where "departed spirits" exist in a state of consciousness is a most unjustifiable assumption, for the Bible teaches no such thing, but just the reverse. "8. That conscious beings are in Hades, and some are tormented there."

This writer sets himself to prove that the parable is founded in fact, but when he comes to the main features of the parable he is compelled to assume them. That the text teaches the consciousness of any part of man while the other part is dead is the very thing to be *proved*, not assumed. There are such beings as "angels," "rich men," "beggars," and "dogs," and there is such a state as hades, consequently, it is argued, there must be consciousness in hades. Why, then, not add also that the inhabitants of heaven and hell must converse with each other, as Abraham and the rich man are held to have literally done? If consciousness is indicated so is the conversation between the dwellers in the two places. There are such objects as trees; there is such a thing as office of king; and there are such affairs as conventions for the purpose of choosing rulers, but who will claim that consequently the parable of the trees is founded upon fact? According to such a no-

tion any parable is founded in fact unless the figures used are something that never were heard of and have no existence. A brilliant conception! Profound thought! The figures used in a parable are facts, of course, as to their existence, but the parable is not so.

A parable is an allegorical representation of something, the thing represented being entirely different from what is chosen to represent it. Hence the "rich man" cannot represent a literal rich man, but something else. Neither can the "beggar" represent a literal beggar. Bishop Lowth remarks:

"Parable is that kind of allegory which consists in a continued narration of fictitious or accommodated events, applied to the illustration of some important truth."

No well instructed Bible student will go to a parable or metaphor to prove a doctrine. Dr. Adam Clarke remarks on Matt. v. 26:

"Let it be remembered, that by the general consent of all, (except the basely interested) no metaphor is ever to be produced in proof of a doctrine. In the things that concern our eternal salvation, we need the most pointed and express evidence on which to establish the faith of our souls."

So we think. Whitby writes:

"That this is only a parable, and not a real history of what was actually done, is evident: 1. Because we find this very parable in the Gemara Babylonicum, whence it is cited by Mr. Sheringham, in the preface to his Joma. 2. From the circumstances of it, viz., the rich man lifting up his eyes in hell, and seeing Lazarus in Abraham's bosom, his discourse with Abraham, his complaint of being tormented with flames, and his de-

sire that Lazarus might be sent to cool his tongue; and if all this be confessedly parable, why should the rest, which is the very parable in the Gemara, be accounted history?"

Says Lightfoot:

"Whoever believes this not to be a parable, but a true story, let him believe also those little friars, whose trade it is to show the monuments at Jerusalem to pilgrims, and point exactly to the place where the house of the 'rich glutton' stood. Most accurate keepers of antiquity indeed! who, after so many hundred years, such overthrows of Jerusalem, such devastations and changes, can make out of the rubbish the place of so private a house, and such a one too, that never had any being, but merely in parable. And that it was a parable, not only the consent of all expositors may assure us, but the thing itself speaks it. The main scope and design of it seems this—to hint the destruction of the unbelieving Jews, who, though they had Moses and the prophets, did not believe them—nay, would not believe, though one (even Jesus) arose from the dead. For that conclusion of the parable abundantly evidenceth what it aimed at."—*Heb. and Talm. Exerc. in Luke* xvi. 19.

Wakefield says:

"It must be remembered, that hades nowhere means hell—gehenna—in any author whatsoever, sacred or profane; and also that our Lord is giving his hearers a parable, (Matt. xiii. 34) and not a piece of real history. To them who regard the narration as a reality, it must stand as an unanswerable argument for the purgatory of the papists. The universal meaning of hades is the state of death."

Let us see how they manage who accept the language as an account of what actually took place. "And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried

by the angels into Abraham's bosom." Will they admit that the beggar himself was carried? No, it is insisted that it was his soul that was carried. Very well, we will so read it. "And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and his soul was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and his soul was buried." Stop! stop! is the cry, it was the rich man that was buried: his soul went to hell. Indeed! this is a strange way of reading an account of what actually happened. That must be a faulty theory truly which requires the application of opposite and conflicting rules of exposition in a single text.

That the parable was designed to illustrate some great truth there can be no question; and the circumstances connected with the ministrations of Jesus, especially those attending the giving of the parable, plainly enough, we think, indicate what that truth is. We believe the parable affords a succinct account of the then past, present and future condition of both Jews and Gentiles. This view is entertained by many who deny inherent immortality, and by some who believe that doctrine, but in adopting the view they do not, as the writer whom we review falsely asserts, "follow in the steps" of "Universalists," for it was held and published long before Universalism.

Theophylact says:

"But this parable can also be explained in the way of allegory; so that we may say, that by the rich man is signified the Jewish people; for they were formerly rich, abounding in all divine knowledge, wisdom, and instruction, which are more excellent than gold or precious stones. And they were arrayed in purple and fine

linen, as they possessed a kingdom and a priesthood, and were themselves a royal priesthood to God. The purple denoted the kingdom, and the fine linen their priesthood; for the Levites were clothed in sacerdotal vestments of fine linen, and they fared sumptuously, and lived splendidly, every day. Daily did they offer the morning and the evening sacrifice, which they also called the continual sacrifice. But Lazarus was the Gentile people, poor in divine grace and wisdom, and lying before the gate; for it was not permitted to the Gentiles to enter the house itself, because they were considered a pollution. Thus, in the Acts of the Apostles, we read that it was alleged against Paul, that he had introduced Gentiles into the temple, and made that holy place common or unclean. Moreover, those people were full of fetid sores of sin, on which the impudent dogs, or devils, fed, who delight themselves in our sores. The Gentiles likewise desired even the crumbs which fell from the table of the rich; for they were wholly destitute of that bread which strengthens the heart of man, and wanted even the smallest morsel of food; so that the Canaanite woman, (Matt. xv. 27,) when she was a heathen, desired to be fed with the crumbs. In short, the Hebrew people were dead unto God, and their bones, which could not be moved to do good, were perished. Lazarus also (I mean the Gentile people), was dead in sin, and the envious Jews, who were dead in sins, did actually burn in a flame of jealousy, as saith the Apostle, on account of the Gentiles being received into the faith, and because that those who had before been a poor and despised Gentile race, who were now in the bosom of Abraham, the father of nations, and justly, indeed, were they thus received. For it was while Abraham was yet a Gentile, that he believed God, and turned from the worship of idols to the knowledge of God. Therefore, it was proper that they who were partakers of this conversion and faith,

should rest in his bosom, sharing the same final lot, the same habitation, and the same blessedness. And the Jewish people longed for one drop of the former legal sprinklings and purifications, to refresh their tongue, that they might confidently say to us, that the law was still efficacious and availing. But it was not; for the law was only until John. And the Psalmist says, sacrifice and oblations thou wouldst not."

Dr. Gill, who, like Theophylact, makes a double application of it, says of the expression, "*the rich man died:*"

"It may also be understood of the political and ecclesiastical death of the Jewish people, which lay in the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, and of the temple, and in the abolition of the temple worship, and of the whole ceremonial law: a Loammi was written upon their church state, and the covenant between God and them was broken; the Gospel was removed from them, which was as death, as the return of it, and their call by it, will be as life from the dead; as well as their place and nation, their civil power and authority were taken away from them by the Romans, and a death of afflictions, by captivity and calamities of every kind has attended them ever since."

Of the expressions, "*in hell*"—"in torments," the same writer says:

"This may regard the vengeance of God on the Jews, at the destruction of Jerusalem, when a fire was kindled against their land, and burned to the lowest hell, and consumed the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains; and the whole land became brimstone, salt, and burning; and they were rooted out of it in anger, wrath, and great indignation—see Deut. xxix. 23, 27, 28; xxxii. 22—or rather the dreadful calamities which came upon them

in the time of Adrian, at Bither; when their false Messiah, Bar Cochab, was taken and slain, and such multitudes of them were destroyed, in the most miserable manner, when that people, who before had their eyes darkened, and a spirit of slumber and stupidity fallen upon them, in those calamities began to be under some conviction."

We would also commend to the careful perusal of all the remarks, on this subject, of James Bate, M. A., Rector of Deptford. He writes:

"We will suppose, then, the rich man who fared so sumptuously, to be the Jew, so amply enriched with the heavenly treasure of divine revelation. The poor beggar who lay at his gate, in so miserable a plight, was the poor Gentile, now reduced to the last degree of want, in regard to religious knowledge. The crumbs which fell from the rich man's table, and which the beggar was so desirous of picking up, were such fragments of patriarchal and Jewish traditions, as their travelling philosophers were able to pick up with their utmost care and diligence. And those philosophers were also the dogs that licked the sores of heathenism, and endeavored to supply the wants of divine revelation, by such schemes and hypotheses, concerning the nature of the gods, and the obligation of moral duties, as (due allowance for their ignorance and frailties) did no small honor to human nature, and yet thereby plainly showed, how little a way unaided reason could go, without some supernatural help, as one of the wisest of them frankly confessed. About one and the same time, the beggar dies, and is carried by the angels (*i. e.*, God's spiritual messengers to mankind) into Abraham's bosom; that is, he is engrafted into the church of God. And the rich man also dies and is buried. He dies what we call a political death. His dispensation ceases. He is rejected from being any longer the peculiar son of God.

The people whom he parabolically represents, are miserably destroyed by the Romans, and the wretched remains of them, driven into exile over the face of the earth, were vagabonds, with a kind of a mark set upon them, like Cain, their prototype, for a like crime; and which mark may perhaps be their adherence to the law. Whereby it came amazingly to pass, that these people, though dispersed, yet still dwell alone and separate, not reckoned among the nations, as Balaam foretold.

"The rich man being reduced to this state of misery, complains bitterly of his hard fate, but is told by Abraham, that he slipped his opportunity, while Lazarus laid hold on his, and now receives the comfort of it. The Jew complains of the want of more evidence, to convince his countrymen, the five brethren, and would fain have Lazarus sent from the dead to convert them. But Abraham tells him, that if their own scripture cannot convince them of their error, neither would they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead. And exactly so it proved in the event. For this parable was delivered toward the end of the third year of our Lord's ministry; and in the fourth, or following year of it, the words put into the mouth of Abraham, as the conclusion of the parable, are most literally verified, by our Lord raising another Lazarus from the dead. And we may presume, that the beggar had the fictitious name of Lazarus given him in the parable, not without some reason, since the supposed request of the rich man was fully answered, by our Lord raising another, and a real Lazarus, from the dead. But what was the consequence? Did this notorious miracle convince the rich man's brethren? No, truly. His visit to them from the dead was so far from convincing them, that they actually consulted together, that they might put Lazarus also to death; because that, by reason of him, many of the Jews went away and believed on Jesus."

The reader will by this time hardly have failed to

conclude with us that the Saviour gives, by the parable, a condensed history of the Jews and Gentiles—Lazarus representing the *Gentiles*, and the *rich man* the *Jews*. Keeping this explication of the parable in mind, the reader will please turn, for an explanation of the *torment*, spoken of, to Deut. xxviii., where God promises the Jews (*the rich man*) certain great blessings, upon condition, as He announces, "that thou hearken unto the commandment of the Lord thy God, which I command thee this day, to observe and to do them;" and where He also denounces against them certain fearful judgments in case of persistent disobedience and rebellion. What God then spake has been and is being fulfilled to the letter.

The Jews (*the rich man*) have been suffering those torments for the last eighteen hundred years. When they rejected Christ they *died* to the political and ecclesiastical privileges which they had so long enjoyed, and became outcasts; while the Gentiles, who, as we have seen, were dependent upon the Jews for religious benefits, *died* to their condition, and were admitted to all the privileges of the Abrahamic covenant, being, throughout this dispensation, instruments in the prosecution of the work of selecting from among the nations a people unto God's name. Christ gave to the apostles the commission to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Thus commissioned, they commenced the work by which very many Gentiles have been brought into the Abrahamic covenant, as the word of God, by Paul, declares: "Know ye therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God

would justify the heathen" (the Gentiles, the beggar), "through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." The Jews, by their rejection of Christ, *severed* their covenant relation to God, while so many of the Gentiles as have accepted him have *established* a covenant relation to God.

Thus it is seen that the conditions of the two, Jews and Gentiles, have been more than reversed, a fact which, we conceive, the parable was given to illustrate. Between these conditions there is a "gulph fixed," and neither Jew nor Gentile can, as such, cross it. The Jew cannot, strictly as such, come into the full covenant relation, because acceptance of Christ is an inexorable condition; and no Gentile can become a Jew, and still maintain the covenant relation, because he must first deny Christ.

We might multiply proof that our exposition is the true design of the parable, and that therefore the exposition which makes it teach consciousness between death and resurrection is an unreasonable and a wrong one, but we forbear, feeling assured that enough has been said to satisfy any sincere seeker after truth.

Part II.

"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."—Dan. xii. 2.

As no one will claim that this passage affords any intimation that man is immortal, we are not under the necessity of noticing it; but its use by many, Mr.

George among the number, as a proof text in support of a universal resurrection, and, consequently, if they are at all consistent, in support of Universalism, for Jesus plainly and positively declared, "they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead," cannot "die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the *children of God, being the children of the resurrection.*"—Luke xx. 35, 36; and Paul declares that the dead are raised in power, glory, and incorruption, we give it some attention in order to correct some of those misapprehensions through which it is subjected to such misuse.

"And many of *them* that sleep." What are the "them" who sleep? There can be but one reply: all will agree that the promise has reference to people, men, and others. But Mr. George simply expresses the opinion of a very large class of theorists when he affirms that what dies is not the *man*, that *men* do not die. The reader will pardon our repeated allusion to this point, for some of the inconsistencies of the position stare us in the face at almost every turn. "Corpses," says he, "are only the remains of men." It will be perceived that this theory denies that there are any *men* sleeping "in the dust of the earth," and so none "shall awake." Is not this a virtual denial that the text teaches any resurrection whatever? How unfortunate for such a position is it that Daniel did not receive latter-day theological instruction. The prophet was simply the mouthpiece of Jehovah, who here emphatically declares that "many *of* them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." We believe the word of promise and rejoice in it. May *all* who profess to love the Lord

believe it, and patiently await the coming of the glorious day; and if, while waiting, death triumphs over us and numbers us with the sleepers "in the dust," may we go down rejoicing in the blessed hope of awaking when Christ shall come with his holy angels.

Many of them who think they find universal resurrection in the text, labor to show, as they are, of course, under the necessity of doing, that the word many is there used in comprehension of the whole. The term *may* sometimes be properly understood as comprehending all, but Dan. xii. 2 is most assuredly not such an instance, for the preposition *of*, immediately following it, is necessarily restrictive, limiting the reference to a class. Did the next sentence but one preceding this commence thus: "many who think they find," etc., we might, by a somewhat forced construction, be understood as referring to *all* that class; but as it reads, "many *of* them who think they find," etc., every reader will understand at once that we except some. *Many of*, in the text, cannot possibly mean the whole: some are manifestly excepted.

Professors Bush, Whiting, and other eminent Hebraists think that the words "some" and "some" are not a correct rendering of the original. The word is a demonstrative pronoun, defined by Gesenius "these." Thus the corrected text would read, "these" (who awake) to everlasting life, but those (who awake not) to shame and everlasting contempt," or abhorrence. Aben Ezra says:

"Those who awake shall be (appointed) to everlasting life, and those who awake not shall be (doomed) to shame and everlasting contempt."

Thomas Read, BIBLE *vs.* TRADITION, remarks:

"*Ailleh—weailleh,* rendered "some" and "some" in English version, are in nearly every other place rendered '*these*' and '*those.*' There is no representative of the word '*some*' in the Hebrew."

Rabbi Saadias Gaon, who lived in the tenth century, in writing on this text, Dan. xii. 2, says:

"This is the resurrection of the dead of Israel whose lot is to eternal life; *but those who do not awake,* they are the destroyed of the Lord."

They who hold to the universal resurrection theory will do well to remember these remarks of Rabbi Gaon in connection with Paul's words as recorded in Acts xxiv. 15, which, it is said, are equal unto an avowal that the apostle believed in a resurrection of *all* the dead, he having said he was a Pharisee, and it being claimed that the Pharisees held to a universal resurrection. This learned Jew affirms the prophecy of Daniel is that some shall awake, and some shall *not.* It cannot be supposed that he could thus interpret the language had he not known that his people of old did not believe *all* would "awake," be raised from the dead. He could only so interpret in the belief that they held that some, at least, would not live again, a fact which, as it precludes the idea that the Pharisees "allowed" Paul's "hope," *if,* as is claimed, that hope embraced a resurrection of all irrespective of character, precludes also the idea that the "hope" *did* embrace a universal resurrection.

A. M. Osbon, D. D., of the M. E. church, published some fifteen years ago, a work entitled "DANIEL VERIFIED IN HISTORY AND CHRONOLOGY." The introduction of the book was written, we believe, by Dr. Whe-

don, long editor of the METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW. The author of the work writes as follows, on Dan. xii. 2:

"Let us recur for a moment to the structure of the passage. This can be best shown by paraphrasing the verse. '*Many* of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some (the many who awake shall awake) to everlasting life, and some (those who do not awake shall sleep in) shame and everlasting contempt. Only the '*many*' who shall be found 'written in the book' shall 'awake.' . . . . It will not help the case at all to quote Romans v. 19, for the passage is not a parallel. The '*many*' of the apostle is a very different thing from the '*many*' of the prophet. The former uses the word to denote all persons of whom he is speaking, '*many* were made sinners;' the latter to designate a portion of a large number, 'many *of* them that sleep in the dust.' It is perfectly apparent, then, that the particle of severalty fixes the antithesis between the states of those who *awake*, and those who *do not awake*, and not between the *states* of those who awake."

It is true the writer of the above applies Dan. xii. 2 to other than a literal resurrection of the dead, but his argument in showing that the awaking will not be a universal one is no less forcible. Certain it is that the passage implies that some of the dead will not be awakened. "Man that is in honor, and understandeth not, is like the beasts that perish. He shall go to the generation of his fathers; they shall *never see light*."

CHAPTER IX.

"*Immortal*"—"*Immortality*"—"*Eternal Life.*"

In our interpretations of Scripture, words and phrases should be accorded their literal and obvious meaning unless there is a manifest necessity for doing otherwise in order to sound sense and harmony with the general tenor of Scripture teaching on any given subject. Richard Watson writes:

"The terms of the record are to be taken in their plain and commonly received sense; figures of speech are to be interpreted with reference to the local peculiarities of the country in which the agents who wrote the record resided; idioms are to be understood according to the genius of the language employed; if any allegorical or mystical discourses occur, the key to them must be sought in the book itself, and not in our own fancies."

Jeremy Taylor remarks:

"In all interpretations of Scripture, the *literal sense* is to be presumed and chosen unless there is evident cause to the contrary."

Hooker says:

"I hold it for a most infallible rule in expositions of sacred Scripture, that when a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst. There is nothing more dangerous and delusive than that act which changes the meaning of words, as alchemy doth or would the substance of metals; making of any thing what it listeth, and bringing in the end all truth to nothing."

Supporters of the theory of inherent immortality long since chose to violate these reasonable and obvious

principles of exegesis in their interpretation of terms which express the penalty of transgression, insisting upon attaching to certain words a meaning differing very widely from what is clearly imported, a meaning almost if not directly the opposite of what is held to attach to the same terms whenever they are met with in any other book than the Bible, and that, too, when the circumstances attendant upon the Scripture use of them necessitate, in order to justice, the plainest and most direct forms of expression.

So-called, orthodox theologists have, we say, long since taken the liberty of affirming that *death*, the divinely announced penalty of sin, means *life in a state of torment*, while the *life* promised as a reward to the obedient, means *happiness*. That this is most bold and unjustifiable assumption, at war with both reason and the simplest principle of justice, every unprejudiced reader of the Bible must see. Dr. John Locke but expresses what ought to be a universal sentiment, when he says: "It seems a strange way of understanding a law which requires the plainest and most direct words, that by 'death' should be meant eternal life in misery." Most of that class of interpreters stop here; but a few, more daring and reckless, go farther.

Having written profusely, and earnestly, and oft-times bitterly in his efforts to prove that all men are immortal, undying, Mr. George comes to the text which declares that God "only hath immortality;" and finding no less unreasonable a way to "dispose of" so plain a "thus saith the Lord," he makes the term "immortality" mean eternal happiness. Lest it should be said that he does not claim that all souls are immortal,

we quote the following written, seemingly, before he had found it necessary to attempt to strip the term immortality of its true meaning. He says: "But did ever any one contend that *immortality* was the *only* attribute of the soul?" Thus we see he has been claiming that soul-entities have certain attributes, one of which is immortality.

If immortality is an "attribute of the soul," *every* soul must be immortal. "But," says he, in another part of his work, "we have found no Scriptures which teach that all men are immortal." True enough: he surely has not; nor will he ever find any. The Bible does not teach that men are immortal, but just the reverse, and hence all are urged to "*seek for*" immortality. Although he uses *soul* and *spirit* interchangeably to express the supposed undying part of man, he says "man has a spirit within him which is unending in its nature, so that it cannot wear out and die." And he adds:

"But that poetry is not fact, which, by some unaccountable means, has found its way into the revised edition of the Methodist Hymn Book, which says, 'Our souls are his immortal breath.'"

As we cannot do him the injustice to even suppose him so ignorant of the facts in the case as not to know that the author of the hymn used the term "immortal" in the sense of undying, and not in the sense of "happy," we must understand him as, in this one instance, affirming *mortality* of man. Then, too, he can now lay no claim to Gen. ii. 7, as favoring the immortal-soul idea. Dr. Adam Clarke says of the words, *God formed man of the dust*:

"In the most distinct manner God shows us that man is a compound being, having a body and a soul, distinctly and separately created; the body out of the dust of the earth, the soul immediately breathed from God himself. . . . Of the soul it is said, *God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.*"

How could the Dr. have more plainly expressed the sentiment, "Our souls are his immortal breath?" Judging from the exceeding great importance attributed to the fact that those who hold what we believe to be the Bible view of man's nature and destiny differ in some particulars, a reader of "Annihilationism not of the Bible," might suppose that its author never held an opinion differing from any leading Methodist mind; but we have elsewhere shown him widely at variance with prominent Methodists, and we now find him characterizing a sentiment expressed by Dr. Clarke and the author of the hymn referred to, as well as by all who sing the hymn believingly, as "poetry" but "not fact." He states what is *true*, but in doing it he inflicts a terrible blow upon his own theory. He yields the very text which some learned and thinking men of the popular faith have been compelled to conclude is about the only one which teaches their doctrine. It is said of the terms "immortal" and "immortality:"

"They are generally considered, in the theological world, to mean, *eternal conscious being;* whereas the *Scriptural import* of the term is, *eternal happiness*, being synonymous with the phrase 'eternal life.'"

Yes, the terms "immortal" and "immortality" are "generally considered," theologically, to mean, primarily, "eternal conscious being;" not subject to death; eternal life; and "mortal" and "mortality" are, in

consequence, held to mean, *temporary conscious being;* subject to loss of life. If, therefore, immortality means "eternal happiness," then, by parity of reasoning, mortal, and mortality must mean *temporary happiness.* Apply such a principle of interpretation to the following, relating to God: "Now unto the King eternal, *eternally happy* (immortal) invisible, the only wise God," etc.—1 Tim. i. 17. How absurd is the supposition that *immortal,* applied to God, means, *eternally happy.* And again: "Which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath *eternal happiness* (immortality)."—1 Tim. vi. 15, 16. Comment is needless.

Read, too, in the light of such an interpretation, the language of Paul, where he proves the resurrection of the dead, and an analogous change in the living, and see what worse than absurdity is produced. The apostle thus writes:

"The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."—1 Cor. xv. 52–54.

The expressions, "dead shall be raised incorruptible," and "this corruption must put on incorruption," refer to the change which is to take place in the dead who will be raised to life; and the expressions, "we shall be changed," and, "this mortal must put on immortality," refer to the change in the condition of believers who shall be then living. *Incorruption* and

immortality, therefore, represent one and the same condition, while their opposites also represent like condition. So if "immortality," in verse 53, means *eternal happiness*, "incorruption," in the same verse, must also mean *eternal happiness;* while "mortal" and "corruptible" must mean, *temporary happiness.* Thus we not only have Paul representing the sorrowing, and struggling, and suffering pilgrims of the last day as being changed from a condition which they could not be said to be in, but we have him also representing the dead in their graves as coming out of a condition of *temporary* happiness to one of *eternal* happiness. None will contend that there is happiness, or even consciousness in the grave. "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave," is the language of inspiration.

But let us see whether the scriptural meaning of the term *life* is happiness; and whether the phrase "eternal life" means, "eternal happiness." Substitute "happiness" for "life," in the following passages: "That he would grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our *happiness* (life)."—Luke i. 74, 75. "In him was *happiness* (life); and the *happiness* (life) was the light of men."—John i. 4. "I am the bread of *happiness* (life)."—John vi. 35.

How transcendently absurd is it to suppose that "life" in the foregoing, and many other texts, means happiness. It will be objected that life does not mean happiness in that class of texts. A convenient style of explaining, truly! Life always means happiness when

it suits a darling theory to have it so, no matter how much it conflicts with or contradicts other portions of Scripture!

If Jesus had meant to convey the idea of "happy" or "happiness," in any of the texts where "life" and "eternal life" occur, he could just as well have used *makarios*, or *makarismos*, as to have used *zoee*, which does not mean happy, or happiness at all, but *life*. He used the former term, *makarios*, more than a score of times to express "happy," or "blessed." We may rest assured Jesus did not use terms which do not express the idea which he wished to convey.

"Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal *happiness* (life). . . . And ye will not come to me, that ye might have *happiness* (life)."—John v. 39, 40. "But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought *happiness* and *eternal happiness* (life and immortality) to light through the Gospel."—2 Tim. i. 10. To make "life," in this text, mean "happiness," is, besides making nonsense of it, to affirm Universalism; for if "life" means happiness, the antithetic term, "death," must mean misery; and how can misery be abolished, except by conferring universal happiness?

We need not quote more texts, enough having been done in that direction to satisfy any reasonable mind that the Scripture import of "life" is not "happiness," nor that of "immortality," "eternal happiness." While Christ promised eternal *life* more than forty times, he *not once* promised eternal *happiness*, a fact in view of which it is worse, far worse than folly to assert that he *meant* to promise happiness. Of course, *life* and *death*

are both sometimes used figuratively, but in all such cases the context renders it easy to determine the fact.

The expressions, "life," having reference to future life, "eternal life," etc., are *many* times used in the New Testament, but we meet with nothing which may be construed into a caution that they are to be understood in any sense other than that of living existence, a conscious being which will not be subject to death. The terms, therefore, mean just what they naturally import. Happiness is inseparably connected with the life which Christ bestows, but it is *life* that is "the gift of God;" the unspeakable joy, glory, and "pleasures forevermore" are consequent upon the bestowal of life. Christ came to give men *life*, so that they may have the joy and the glory. *Literal life*, a conscious existence that will not be subject to interruption by death is the *promise of the gospel;* it is the *gospel hope.* It is said, assuming that 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16, refers to Christ:

"The man Christ Jesus is the only man who has not been affected by the fall, and who, consequently, did not suffer the loss of immortality by it."

In other words (immortality being held to mean eternal happiness) Christ possessed eternal happiness, just such happiness (life) as is promised to the saints, when he was tempted, hungered, spit upon, buffeted, scourged, and finally crucified. If a man may possess eternal happiness and still be subject to such anguish as Christ is represented as suffering in Gethsemane, when, it is recorded, "being in agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood," or when he cried, "My God, my God, why hast

thou forsaken me," how may we *know* that its possessor will *ever* be secure against suffering? We had supposed that we were, by what we had already seen, prepared for any thing in the way of absurdity, but we had evidently miscalculated the ability of some in that direction. In the first place the language cannot refer to Christ, for, there being a God and Father over all, Christ cannot be said to *only* have immortality (eternal happiness, as is claimed). Beside, it is said, "whom no man hath seen;" and we know that Christ was seen even in his incorruptible state. Paul would hardly write thus of one whom, he affirms, he had himself seen.

The fact is, eternal happiness is not and cannot be subject to *any* sorrow, much less such agony as "the man Christ Jesus" suffered at various times, and hence it is pitiable to talk about "the man Christ Jesus" possessing "eternal happiness" before his death, and resurrection from the dead; quite as pitiable is it as to talk of his being immortal, in the true sense of the term, while he was yet subject to death. We are led to think that the depths of folly into which men may sink in their efforts to sustain a false theory are immeasurable.

"None of the ungodly will inherit immortality in the sense of the term as employed in the Scriptures ... None but the saints are heirs to Bible immortality."

Thus we see our author plainly admits that the ungodly will not inherit immortality; that no man is immortal now, the "saints" being only "heirs" to immortality. We have dwelt thus at length on this subject because he has staked all upon the assumption that the Scripture meaning of *eternal life* and *immortality* is "eternal happiness;" and we have, as the reader has

seen, shown that the interpretation is far more than untrue; it robs certain Scripture language of its force and renders it senseless and ridiculous. So far from being true, it cannot even lay a reasonable claim to truth. "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life," literal life that will endure forever. *Life* is the gift, but the gift, when bestowed, will be accompanied by glory and delights far too great to enter "into the heart of man to conceive."

Although, in our examination of the texts that are by many relied on with some degree of confidence to sustain the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, we have found some things which, superficially considered, are somewhat calculated to confirm the prejudices of those who go to the Bible with not only a strong conviction that inherent or natural immortality is true, but with a determination also to make *some* part of the word of God teach it, we have found nothing which, interpreted in the light of all well-understood Scripture language, could possibly create such a belief. It should not be forgotten that not a few theologists and Bible students who hold to the doctrine frankly admit that it is not found in the Bible.

Watson, the great Methodist, says:

"Some suppose consciousness is an essential attribute of spirit; and the soul is naturally immortal; the former of which cannot be proved, while the latter is contradicted by the Bible, which makes our immortality a gift dependent on the will of the giver."

Watson is strictly correct in saying that inherent immortality is "contradicted by the Bible, which makes our immortality a *gift* dependent on the will of the giv-

er." God has nowhere said he would give immortality to any but the saints; but it *is* said, "all the wicked will he destroy." Again, in attempting to prove that the presence of an immaterial soul with the body is the source of animal life, Mr. Watson says:

"It is granted that, on the premises laid down, not only must an immaterial principle be allowed to man, but to all animals possessed of volition; and few, perhaps none, are found without this property . . . It does not, however, follow that they are *immortal* because they are *immaterial.* The truth is, that God only hath independent immortality, because he only is self-existent, and neither human nor brute souls are of *necessity* immortal."

Darby, in his *Hopes of the Church,* says:

"We would express our conviction that the idea of the immortality of the soul has *no source in the gospel;* that it comes, on the contrary, from the Platonists."

These are testimonies of learned men, and as they *believed* the doctrine, we may be sure they would have found it in the Bible were it there. A simple acknowledgment of the fact that the Bible does not teach it, would have been very significant; but they go farther, one of them affirming that it is "*contradicted* by the Bible," the other that it "has no source in the gospel," but "comes, on the contrary, from the Platonists." The reader can easily see why such strenuous efforts are made to show that "immortality" does not mean immortality at all, but something else. The attempt, however, itself lamentable, has resulted, as must always be the case, in most miserable failure, rendering its authors, whoever they may be, objects of commiseration.

Hereafter, when any advocates of inherent immor-

tality desire to shield that theory from the overwhelming force of the truth that it is not a child of inspiration, it will become them well to attempt to show that the above named and many other learned men and leaders among them have studied the Bible to little purpose, on the question. Until they do this, it were better that they manifest a more mild and Christian spirit in their treatment of those who differ with them.

Archbishop Whately, speaking of the reward of the saints, and the doom of the impenitent, observes:

"What that doom will be, whether the terms in which it is commonly spoken of in Scripture—'death,' 'destruction,' 'perishing,' etc., are to be understood figuratively, as denoting immortal life in a state of misery, or more literally, as denoting a final extinction of existence—this is quite a different question. It is certain that the words, 'life,' 'eternal life,' 'immortality,' etc., are always applied to the condition of those, and of those only, who shall at the last day be approved 'as good and faithful servants,' who are to 'enter into the joy of their Lord.'

"'Life,' as applied to their condition, is usually understood to mean 'happy life.' And that theirs will *be* a happy life, we are indeed plainly taught; but I do not think we are anywhere taught that the word 'life' does of itself necessarily imply happiness. If so indeed, it would be a mere tautology to speak of a 'happy life;' and a contradiction, to speak of a 'miserable life;' which we know is not the case, according to the usage of any language. In all ages and countries, 'life,' and the words answering to it in other languages, have always been applied, in ordinary discourse, to a wretched life, no less properly than to a happy one. Life, therefore, in the received sense of the word, would apply equally to the condition of the blest and of the con-

demned, supposing these last to be destined to continue forever living in a state of misery. And yet, to *their* condition the words 'life' and 'immortality' never are applied in Scripture. If therefore we suppose the hearers of Jesus and his Apostles to have understood, as nearly as possible in the ordinary sense, the words employed, they must naturally have conceived them to mean (if they were taught nothing to the contrary) that the condemned were really and literally to be 'destroyed,' and cease to exist; not, that they were to exist forever in a state of wretchedness. For they are never spoken of as being kept alive, but as *forfeiting* life: as for instance, 'Ye will not come unto me that ye may *have life:*'—'He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath *not* life.' And again, 'perdition,' 'death,' 'destruction,' are employed in numerous passages to express the doom of the condemned. All which expressions would, as I have said, be naturally taken in their usual and obvious sense, if nothing were taught to the contrary.

"That these expressions however are to be understood not in their ordinary sense, but figuratively, to signify an immortality of suffering, is inferred, by a large proportion of Christians, from some other passages: as, where our Lord speaks of 'everlasting punishment,' 'everlasting fire,' and of being 'cast into hell, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.'

"This last expression of his is taken from the book of the prophet Isaiah (lxvi. 24), who speaks of 'the carcasses of the men that have transgressed, whose worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh:' describing evidently the kind of doom inflicted by the eastern nations on the vilest offenders, who were not only slain, but their bodies deprived of the rites of burial, and either burned to ashes (which, among them, was regard-

ed as a great indignity,) or left to moulder above ground and be devoured by worms.

"From such passages as these it has been inferred that the sufferings, and consequently, the life, of the condemned, is never to have an end. And the expressions will certainly bear that sense; which would perhaps be their most obvious and natural meaning, if these expressions were the only ones on the subject that are to be found in Scripture. But they will also bear another sense; which, if not more probable in itself, is certainly more reconcilable with the ordinary meaning of the words 'destruction,' etc., which so often occur. The expressions of 'eternal punishment,' 'unquenchable fire,' etc., may mean merely that there is to be *no deliverance*—no revival—no restoration—of the condemned. 'Death,' simply, does not shut out the hope of being brought to life again: 'eternal death' does. 'Fire' may be *quenched* before it has entirely consumed what it is burning: 'unquenchable fire' would seem most naturally to mean that which destroys it utterly.

"It may be said indeed, that supposing man's soul to be an immaterial being, it cannot be consumed and *destroyed* by literal *material* fire or worms. That is true: but no more can it *suffer* from these. We all know that no fire, literally so called, can give us any pain unless it reach our bodies. The 'fire,' therefore, and the 'worm' that are spoken of, must at any rate, it would seem, be something figuratively so called;—something that is to the soul, what worms and fire are to a body. And as the effect of worms or fire is not to *preserve* the body they prey upon, but to consume, destroy, and put an end to it, it would follow, if the correspondence hold good, that the fire, figuratively so called, which is prepared for the condemned, is something that is really to destroy and put an end to them; and is called 'everlasting' or 'unquenchable' fire, to

denote that they are not to be saved from it, but that their destruction is to be *final.* So in the parable of the tares, our Lord describes himself as saying, 'gather ye first the tares, and bind them in bundles to *burn them;* but gather the wheat *into my garner;*' as if to denote that the one is to be (as we know is the practice of the husbandman) carefully preserved, and the other, completely put an end to."—*Future State, pp.* 180–184.

CHAPTER X.

EVERLASTING MISERY.

HERE it is proper to briefly notice another and small class of texts, of which the following is a member:

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal."—Matt. xxv. 46.

These closing words of Matthew's account of the judgment scene depicted by our Saviour, as well as a very few similar texts, are not unfrequently urged in support of man's immortality. We can easily see how they may be so regarded, so far as respects those living at the time of Christ's return, by people who hold the immortal-soul view, but we are certain that neither a simple perusal nor a close examination of the whole account would suggest to any stranger to that theory the idea of immortality of man or any thing connected with him. What was Jesus discoursing upon? He was describing the judgment of the world at his second coming; the judgment of those who shall be then living. This is undeniable; for, says he, verses 31 and

32, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations."

Were we to say, "all the nations of Europe are at war," would any person understand us to mean that all the dead of those various nationalities had been raised to life, and were engaged in the strife? No individual would so interpret the language: and yet it would be no more unreasonable to do so than to thus interpret the language of Jesus. Is there any thing said in the whole account about a resurrection of the dead? Nothing. Why, then, *assume* that reference is made to any but those who will be living at the coming of Christ? The language affords not the faintest intimation of such a thing, much less can it be held to justify the assumption.

Our Lord says, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy *angels* with him;" but he says nothing about any *saints* accompanying him. It is a significant fact that in all the numerous Scripture allusions to the final consummation, the rewarding of the saints, the establishment of the universal and everlasting kingdom, etc., etc., there is no hint that any part of God's people will be brought from any intermediate state of consciousness; but it is always their *resurrection*, their being *raised from the dead*. The fact is not only significant, it cannot be reasonably accounted for on the assumption that souls exist somewhere in a state of consciousness between death and resurrection.

No unprejudiced reader of the Bible can well fail

to see that while special judgments are sometimes denounced against enemies of the Lord, *death*, the penalty of sin, is the general and final punishment inflicted upon all sinners: and if that death is irrevocable, as is the case with those who die in impenitence, then the punishment is everlasting, unending. Numerous strenuous efforts have been made to overcome the force of this simple truth, but they have alike utterly failed. It presents an insurmountable bulwark. The punishment is deprivation of life, and if the life is never restored the punishment is eternal.

One of the fallacies by which many of our friends on the other side of the question are misled consists in assuming that death is no longer punishment when consciousness has ceased. It is true that punishment by the infliction of a corrective penalty, should, to be effective, be attended with consciousness, but not so with punishment intended to be strictly exemplary. For instance, if a man should be, for some crime, condemned, as an exemplary punishment, to deprivation of life, the *punishment* would commence when life was extinct (the process of deprivation being only the means of infliction, and hence no part of the punishment proper), and will continue so long as death continues; and nobody would be so absurd as to say there was no punishment inflicted because the man was not conscious of the fact of his death.

Or, again: Suppose a man were, for some offence, condemned to be punished by deprivation of his liberty for sixty days, for instance, and on the day of his incarceration he should, by reason of some physical derangement, become totally unconscious, and should re-

main so for fifty-nine days: could any one in authority be found to decide, at the expiration of sixty days, that the man had not received the prescribed punishment because he was unconscious during nearly the whole period? Of course there could not. If men assert that there can be no *torment* in the absence of consciousness, they say truly; but to assert that eternal death is not eternal *punishment* because there is no consciousness of it is to affirm what a dispassionate view of the case will, we think, show to be a manifest absurdity.

The language of the text plainly indicates what the states of the two classes spoken of will be. The two states are opposites, and as the righteous go into *life eternal*, the everlasting punishment to which the wicked are consigned *must* be eternal death. This may justly be considered conclusive, especially as we have shown that "life" means *life* and not *happiness*, as is so persistently and unreasonably urged.

But there are other considerations bearing directly on this subject; facts connected with the Scripture use of *everlasting, eternal*, and like terms. They sometimes express the idea not of unending *cause*, but of unending *effect*. This is so well set forth in the following letter, dated, London, Sept. 6, 1864, that we give it entire, and thus close our remarks on this point:

"TO THE MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE UNION.

"DEAR FELLOW LABORERS: As a knowledge of the sense in which the words Eternal and Everlasting are used in Holy Scripture is essential to a comprehension of Divine Revelation, and as much difference of opinion is now expressed respecting the sense in which these

words are there used, I purpose submitting to your consideration a few observations upon it.

"These words often in Holy Scripture have relation, *only*, to the duration of what has been effected, and not at all to the duration of what has been the cause of such effect—and this even in the places where there is mention only of the duration of such cause.

"Thus where it is stated in St. Jude that the Sodomites 'are set forth as an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire:' the fire of the Sodomites, if they were annihilated by it, was, as to them, eternal; they never did, or never will behold it, not continuing to exist; and the example of its having been to them productive of such an effect, is the same as to us; but the example of its being such as to its own duration, has no existence to any one to whom this Scripture is addressed, although what is stated specified alone the duration of the fire, which is alone the cause of what has been effected. Thus the qualification *eternal* does not here relate to the duration of the cause, but to the duration of its effect.

"Hence it is quite consistent with the language of Holy Scripture that in the statement in St. Mark of, 'The worm that never dies, and the fire that is never quenched,' the dying and the quenching does not relate to the duration of the existence of either the worm or the fire, but to the duration of their effect on the party affected by them. To him that it annihilated by them, their existence, in the language of Holy Scripture, is eternal or everlasting, even though his cognizance of that existence was confined to a few hours, minutes, or even seconds.

"But the sense of everlasting and eternal can never be decided until the facts revealed respecting man's nature be first determined. Does Holy Scripture reveal that man, under all circumstances, is an immortal ex-

istence, or that he is capable of annihilation? We read, John iii. 16, that 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' Perish is here used to express a state opposite to ever-living, that is, not forever living, or, being annihilated; and it is never used in any other sense. God then, gave his Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not be annihilated.

"Thus Holy Scripture reveals, That man is capable of *annihilation:* and yet it is true to state respecting him, that his worm never dies; that the fire of his punishment is never quenched; and that both his punishment and his joy are eternal and everlasting.

"In Holy Scripture language no joy can be designated eternal, of which in itself, or in its effects, man does not eternally partake.

"I remain, DEAR FELLOW LABORERS, ever truly yours, "HERMAN HEINFETTER."

PART II.

CHAPTER XI.

HAVING shown that those parts of Scripture which are relied on to prove the dogma of inherent immortality do not sustain that doctrine, we now proceed to demonstrate, by reference to *some* of the very many texts bearing directly upon this subject, that the contrary doctrine is plainly the Bible one.

In the early part of this work we proved conclusively, as we think, that the language *thou shalt surely die*, expressing, as it does, the penalty of transgression, cannot, without violating the laws of language, be understood as meaning any thing but the literal death of the whole man. The language used in pronouncing sentence upon Adam, after the fall, not only abundantly evidences this, it renders any position based on a different interpretation of the words wholly untenable. As therefore the penalty of the law, the "wages of sin" is literal death, death of all that goes to make up the responsible being, it follows inevitably that natural immortality cannot be true, and also that all conscious life forever ceases at death unless there is a resurrection from

the dead. The term *death* is, of course, sometimes used in a tropical sense, but when it expresses or relates directly to the penalty of sin, its meaning is *deprivation of life.* To the question, then, concerning the final condition of the wicked.

THEY PERISH.

The term *perish* means, to be destroyed; to go to destruction; to come to nothing; to be blotted from existence; to lose life; to decay. It therefore means the opposite of preservation, whether applied to animate or inanimate objects. "Neither do men put new wine into old bottles, else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles *perish:* but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved."—Matt. ix. 17. All will at once see the sense in which perish is here used; that its meaning is the opposite of preserved. *Perish* can never be justly held to mean preservation.

"We shall give a few quotations explanatory of the original words translated *perish. Sophoh* means *to come to an end.*

"1 Sam. xxvi. 9, David said of Saul, 'Destroy him not . . . The Lord shall smite him; or his day shall come to die; or he shall descend into battle and (*sophoh*) *come to an end.*' But if the 'immortal soul' of Saul lives, then certainly he has neither perished nor *come to an end.* So in 1 Sam. xxvii. 1.

"Another word translated perish is *gova,* to waste away, to decay. Josh. xxii. 20, And Achan ('*gova,*) wasted away not alone in his iniquity.' Job xxxiv. 14, 'If God set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his *ruah,* spirit, and his *nesme,* breath; all flesh shall (*gova,*) *decay* together, and man shall turn again unto dust.' If the man decays and turns to dust again,

what is left but the spirit of the breath of lives which is not a conscious thing, and which God has gathered into the great reservoir of all animal life? Job xxxiv. 12, 'But if they obey not, they shall (*gova*) *waste away* by the sword, and they shall die without knowledge.'

"A word implying the most complete destruction, translated *perish*, is *shomad*, to *annihilate*. Psa. lxxxiii. 9, 10, 'Do unto them as unto . . . Jabin, at the brook Kishon: who (*shomad*) were *annihilated* at Endor: they became as dung for the earth.' As living beings, they were put out of existence. Such language could not apply to such as had 'immortal souls;' but as it does apply to those that were annihilated at Endor, it proves that they had no such Pagan appendages.

"Other strong words translated perish, are *adai ouvaid*, utter destruction. Num. xxiv. 19, 20, 'Out of Jacob shall he come (Christ) that shall have dominion.' And when Balaam 'looked on Amalek, he took up his parable, and said, Amalek was the first of the nations, but his latter end shall be (*adai ouvaid*) utter destruction forever.' 23 v., 'And he took up his parable, and said, Alas, who shall live when God doeth this! And ships shall come from Chittim, and shall afflict Asshur, and shall afflict Eber, and he also shall be (*adai ouvaid*) *utter destruction forever.*' As this is a prophecy to take place under the judicial reign of Christ, it must imply the final disposition of these nations—they will be utterly exterminated. Thus we see that many of the Hebrew words are much more forcible than the English word *perish*.

"We turn to the N. T. *Kata-ptheiro*. *Ptheiro* means to corrupt, and *kata* renders the word more intensive. 2 Pet. ii. 12, 'But these as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption.' This is a terrible denunciation against false teachers; like the beasts made for no

other purpose but to corrupt; these like them shall corrupt in the utter corruption of their own nature. The manner of their perishing is like that of beasts; as beasts were not made for eternal torments but for slaughter and corruption, so are these. The simple form of the word is applied to beasts, and both the simple and intensive to these men.

"*Apolonto*, destroyed. Jude 11 v., 'Wo is to them; for they have gone in the way of Cain, and have run far in the error of Balaam's hire, and have (*apolonto*) perished in the rebellion of Korah.' We refer farther to 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16; Matt. xviii. 14; Luke xiii. 3; Acts viii. 20; Psa. lxxiii. 29; xcii. 9; Prov. xii. 9; Deut. viii. 19; Judges v. 31; Job iv. 9, 20; xx. 7; Psa. ii. 12; ix. 3; x. 16; xxxvii. 20; lxviii. 2; lxxxiii. 1; cxii. 10; Isa. xli. 11; Acts xiii. 41; 1 Cor. i. 18; viii. 11; xv. 18. These thirty-two texts declare that the wicked shall perish; and perish always implies death."—*Bible vs. Tradition.* pp. 237–239.

Job xx. 4–7, "Knowest thou not this of old, since man was placed upon the earth, that the triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment? Though his excellency mount up to the heavens, and his head reach unto the clouds; yet he shall *perish forever*, like his own dung."

We cannot but feel that no person, unless he be thoroughly fortified with prejudice, can read this passage and not be impressed with the fact that *perish* is here employed to express the idea of absolute, literal destruction. It can mean no less. The comparison instituted is such as to render any doubt concerning the true meaning of the text a simple absurdity.

Psa. xxxvii. 20: "But the wicked shall *perish*, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume awa ."

Can the reader conceive of any arrangement of words which would more emphatically and unquestionably declare the destruction of the wicked? They "shall be as the fat of lambs." Is there any thing about the fat of lambs that is indestructible? Does it continue forever? No, it consumes away. Thus it is with the wicked. They shall consume. Their destruction is as absolute as the fat of lambs, which consumes away "into smoke."

Psa. xlix. 12, 14: "Nevertheless, man being in honor abideth not: he is like the beasts that *perish*. . . . Like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them; and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning; and their beauty shall consume in the grave from their dwelling."

Here the Spirit declares particularly with reference to such wicked as are of high estate in this world. They are rich and proud. "Their inward thought is, that their houses shall continue forever, and their dwelling places to all generations: they call their lands after their own names." Yet notwithstanding their high estate, and their wealth and its accompanying power, they are like the *beasts that perish*. *Like sheep* they are laid in the grave. How are sheep put in the grave, *sheol*, the state of death? They are put in it never to return out. They *perish* and are as though they *had not been*. So, saith the Spirit, is it with the wicked. Death feeds, or pastures on them, consuming them utterly. Dr. Clarke says *Houbigant* reads the verse thus:

"Like sheep they shall be laid in the place of the dead; death shall feed on them: their morning shepherds rule over them, and their flesh is to be consumed. Destruction is to them in their folds."

How is it possible for such language as occurs in the forty-ninth Psalm, in describing the destiny of the impenitent, to be understood in any other way than as teaching the destruction of the wicked? Certainly no right-minded person will seriously question that to become like beasts at death, or to be like beasts in death is to be made an end of forever. Death pastures on them and *consumes* them. In contrast to the condition of the unrighteous, the psalmist says: "But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave," *sheol*, the state of death (the reader will remember that David's soul was David himself: "God will redeem me.") Thus we have it all. Those of one class are *redeemed from death*, while those of the other are not redeemed but *perish* therein. "Man that is in honor, and understandeth not, is like the beasts that *perish*." There is no gainsaying this plain and direct testimony of inspiration. It is the word of God, who cannot lie. Let us, then, believe it and conform our faith to it rather than attempt to make it conform to our faith.

"A false witness shall not be unpunished, and he that speaketh lies shall *perish*."—Prov. xix. 9.

Here the wise man speaks in strict conformity with all other inspired testimony. They who die in their sins shall *perish*.

Luke xiii. 1–5: "There were present at that season some that told him of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. And Jesus answering said unto them, Suppose ye that these Galileans were sinners above all Galileans, because they suffered such things? I tell you, Nay: but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise *perish*. Or those eighteen, upon

whom the tower in Siloam fell, and slew them, think ye that they were sinners above all men that dwell in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay: but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise *perish*."

Here again there can be no serious question as to the meaning of *perish*. But if those wicked men had immortal souls they could not be said to perish. Very many of those Jews who repented not did perish, first by the Roman sword, and subsequently in the destruction of Jerusalem.

2 Cor. ii. 15: "For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that *perish*." Here is a reference to the final destiny of the two classes, when the righteous have been saved and the ungodly have perished, lost their being.

1 Cor. xv. 17, 18: "And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*."

The apostle urges upon the Corinthians the fact that if there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ is not raised, and even those who have died in the faith are *perished*, thus sharing in the lot of the wicked. This, however, would be an impossibility if men possess immortal souls.

Orthodoxists insist that PERISH, when applied to the destiny of the wicked, implies that they are consigned to endless misery. But if the righteous have undying entities which pass at death into a state of happiness, how, if there be no resurrection, can they be said to "have perished?" It could not consistently be said of them, for it would not be true. But if, as the New Testament plainly teaches, men are dependent for a

future life, upon a resurrection from the dead, then it follows inevitably that if there should be no resurrection, the righteous dead have *perished,* lost their being entirely, like the wicked.

John Wesley admits that according to Paul's argument, if there be no resurrection then "they which have fallen asleep in Christ" "*have lost their life and being together.*" When a man loses *life and being together,* he cannot be alive in any sense whatever. The *man* is then *annihilated.*

Defenders of the theory of inherent immortality should not permit themselves to overlook Paul's object in introducing this argument to prove a resurrection. In writing to the Corinthians Paul knew, of course, that if he could show to those who denied the resurrection, that their doctrine involved the position that such of their beloved associates in the faith as had died were *lost,* they could not fail to see their error. Hence he *did* show them that the doctrine of a future resurrection is not only *true,* but all-important, for should it not transpire, then their brethren who had died in the faith *are lost, perished.* But if the righteous were in a state of happy consciousness between death and resurrection, and surely if they had consciousness at all it would be a happy one then, as we have remarked, it could not be said, even if there should be no resurrection, that they which have "fallen asleep in Christ are perished." It could not be said because it would not be true.

Says Lange's Commentary:

"If Christ did not rise for our justification, then those whose death seemed but a blessed sleep to a hap-

py awaking in fellowship with their living and glorified Redeemer, so far from having been received into eternal life, were doomed to still abide under the wretched dominion of death. A consequence like this must have made too profound an impression upon the loving disposition of Christians to be lightly allowed."

It may be said that these remarks of Lange are inconsistent with his known views concerning the state of the dead. True, but he nevertheless here frankly states the point of Paul's argument. As to inconsistency, we confess to never having read a so-called orthodox commentary, or theological work of any kind which is not self-contradictory. And this arises from the fact that the popular faith is absolutely irreconcilable with Scripture teaching. Lange remarks in connection with what we have just quoted, that perdition is "the state of damnation, remaining in Gehenna." But how, even in the event of there being no resurrection, the righteous can be said to *remain* in Gehenna, a place to which no one will claim they are assigned, must require a wonderfully skilled theologian to see. Men may say what they will, but there stands the fact that if there be no resurrection of the dead, "then they also which have fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*;" and most persons know what perished means. Paul could not have thus based the Christian's whole hope of being saved from *perishing* upon a resurrection from the dead, if, resurrection or no resurrection, they were not only immortal and could not perish, but were happy in a disembodied state.

In view of the theory, therefore, that "they which have fallen asleep in Christ" are already enter-

ed upon the enjoyment of heavenly blessedness, or any degree of blessedness, will any candid person undertake to tell us how their being *saved* from *perishing* depends upon the resurrection of Christ? If they are immortal and in a state of happiness, then *they* are secured against all danger of *perishing* whether Christ has or has not risen. To suppose they who fell asleep in Christ either before or after his death, but especially before, were placed beyond the possibility of perishing in the event of Christ's failure to come forth from the grave, is to render Paul's language both meaningless and absurd.

The apostle expresses precisely the same idea in the following:

1 Cor. xv. 32: "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

Upon the assumption that the real, thinking person is conscious between death and the resurrection, and in the case of believers that consciousness is a happy one, Paul must have been guilty of extreme folly in saying that if the dead rise not, "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," for he could not be ignorant of the fact that thus himself and all saints would be *unspeakably* advantaged, even if the dead shall *never* rise. He did not argue, "if the dead rise not we still have immortal entities that must either be happy or miserable, and hence we must deny ourselves and labor faithfully in the cause of Christ." No, nothing of that; but he stakes all upon the resurrection of the dead,

and says, if there is no truth in that, if such an event is never to transpire, let us eat and drink and enjoy life upon true Epicurean principles, for to-morrow we die, and beyond that there is nothing.

There is no such thing as misunderstanding this language of the apostle. His position is, *if no resurrection, no future life;* a proposition which would be utterly baseless if men never wholly lose life. The question, "What advantageth it me," is a strong way of putting the negative. It is equal to the assertion that his whole struggle in defence of Christianity was but a fruitless and aimless hazarding of life, "if the dead rise not." But *could* this be so if the righteous have a future reward other than that which comes by a resurrection? Plainly it could not. One of the most popular commentaries seems to seek to break the force of Paul's language thus:

"IF THE DEAD RISE NOT? This clause is not to be connected with what precedes (as in the E. V.,) as though designed to explain the words 'after the manner of men;' or as forming a second condition to the question just put" (what advantageth it me?) "although according to the sense, it belongs with it; but because of the concinnity of the clauses, it must be connected with what follows."

Who does not see that the phrase in question "belongs" to the whole text, and cannot, without injustice, be severed from it. If, however, it were otherwise, our friends of the popular faith concerning man's nature and destiny would be welcome to all the aid and comfort it would afford them. For how, pray tell us, does it essentially affect the matter whether it be said, "what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not?" or whether it

be said, "if the dead rise not, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die?" In either case all hope of reward is made to depend upon a resurrection from the dead.

Commenting on this passage, a writer of some fifty years since remarks:

"If, during the whole of my stay at Ephesus, I have encountered the most savage treatment from wicked and interested men, who were ready to devour me like beasts of prey, this conflict, as well as many others, I have endured with resolution and cheerfulness, animated by the hope of a recompense at the resurrection of the just. But, upon the principles that some among you adopt, what have I to expect? It were better for us all, if there be no resurrection, and no future life, (for without a resurrection there can be no life to come,) to renounce the Christian religion, which requires temperance, self-denial, and self-government, and to adopt at once the licentious maxim of the Epicurean philosophy: As life is short, and we have nothing to expect hereafter, let us make the most of it while we live, and indulge ourselves without restraint in the gratification of sense and appetite.

"Observe here, the great stress which the apostle lays upon the doctrine of a resurrection of the dead. The whole expectation of a future life rests upon the fact. If there is no resurrection, there is no life to come: otherwise the apostle's argument is of no weight."

Dr. Priestley, also commenting on the text, says:

"It is evident from this passage that the apostle had no idea of any hope after death but upon the doctrine of a resurrection. In all his writings he never mentions, nor alludes to, any state of consciousness between death and the resurrection; not even when he is comforting Christians on the death of their deceased friends,

on which occasion it was in a manner unavoidable, and indeed it never was or could be overlooked by any person who really believed it. Here he says, if the dead rise not, all ends with this life, and therefore we may as well make the most of it. But this inference would be by no means just, if happiness or misery awaited the souls of men after death, though there should be no resurrection of the body."

As Paul stated to the Corinthians, and that, too, in the same chapter, "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel," and yet said nothing whatever about any soul entity, but set forth the resurrection as the only means of obtaining a future life, it follows that there can be no reasonable question as to which is truth. There can be no such thing as consciousness in death, according to Paul, and he is in harmony with all other inspired testimony, and hence is right in asserting that if there is no resurrection, then they who fell asleep in Christ *perished*, which is, says John Wesley, *lost their life and being together*. The same apostle, seeking to comfort those brethren at Thessalonica who had lost friends by death, thus wrote.

"But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep."

If the conscious existence of an entity between death and resurrection formed any part of Paul's theology this was just the occasion for him to make some mention

of it; for he could and, of course, would have told his brethren that their deceased friends are happy now, and will accompany Christ when he descends. Most theologists of the present time are so well satisfied with their faith in the idea of glorification in death they forget to say *any thing about* Christ's return. How unlike Pauline theology is theirs. Upon no rational hypothesis can the absence both here and in the fifteenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, of all allusion to such a doctrine be harmonized with the assumption that he believed it.

It is well known that *prevent*, in the passage, is used in the sense of *precede*. In earlier English literature it had that meaning, and the translators so used it as a proper representative of the Greek term. We cannot justly suppose the apostle would undertake so objectless and senseless a task as would be that of assuring the Thessalonian brethren that their friends who had died in the faith shall not be left behind when the living saints are caught up to meet our coming Lord, if those friends are already with Christ when he comes, and so cannot possibly be left behind. Such language under such circumstances would be absurd.

The language and the circumstances necessitate the conclusion that Paul is here consistent with what he wrote to the Corinthians. The great idea in all his writings on the subject is that as the salvation scheme was perfected by the resurrection of Christ, so salvation of believers from *perishing* is only by a resurrection of those who have died, and an analagous change in those then living. Hence it is he comforts mourners with the assurance that they who "are alive and remain unto the

coming of the Lord," shall not *go before, precede, be glorified sooner* than they who have fallen asleep, for "the dead in Christ shall *rise* first: *then* we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in clouds" (omit *the*) "to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." Thus all will be glorified together. Even believers, then, who go down into death cease to praise God, and are silent in that state until he who has power over it shall come and unlock its prison doors and let his people go free, never more to be subject to it. May all our readers see to it that their names are written in the "book of life," that so they may share in that glorious triumph.

John iii. 14–16: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

Having heretofore shown that the Bible meaning of "everlasting life," "eternal life," etc., is just what the terms naturally import, it is at once seen that *perish*, in the text, being put in contrast to eternal life and everlasting life, must, beyond all reasonable question, mean the very opposite of those terms. God gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*, go out of existence forever, but should, at the divinely appointed time, happily now near at hand, have *everlasting life*.

It is notable that the second part of ver. 16 is a repetition of ver. 15. It is significant as making emphat-

ic not only the great objective fact of salvation, but as no less emphatically showing what it is that God gave His Son to save men from. And as none but those who looked upon the brazen serpent which "Moses lifted up," experienced the saving influence which followed the act of looking upon it, so faith in Christ, who was raised up from the dead, and is now exalted to the right hand of God, is believed to be essential to the salvation of all who hear the gospel.

Acts xiii. 40, 41: "Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you, which is spoken of in the prophets; Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and *perish*."

2 Pet. ii. 12: "But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and *destroyed*, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and shall utterly *perish* in their own corruption."

There is little excuse for misapprehension of language which asserts that certain wicked men were "to be taken and *destroyed*,' like "brute beasts," and shall *utterly perish in their own corruption*. Such language could not be applied to beings possessed of an incorruptible nature and therefore incapable of perishing.

John x. 27, 28: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never *perish*, neither shall any man pluck them out of my Father's hand."

2 Pet. iii. 9: "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should *perish*."

2 Thess. ii. 10: "And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that *perish;* because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved."

Acts viii. 20: "But Peter said unto him, Thy money

perish with *thee*, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money."

Perish, when it expresses the doom of ungodly men, means, it is said, to suffer eternal misery. We must, then, understand Peter as saying, "Thy money suffer eternal misery with thee," for money and possessor were denounced alike. But how absurd! "As wax melteth before the fire, so let the wicked *perish* at the presence of God."

Many more texts might be quoted to show that they who die in impenitence perish forever, but we think enough has been done to satisfy any candid mind. Man is an animal being. As such he is mortal, and unless God shall exercise His preventing power, the whole race must perish. But this He proposes to do. "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth* in him should not *perish*." It is only those who *believe* that are subjects of that preventing power, hence no promise has been made to save unbelievers from perishing. Believers are saved by a resurrection from the dead; but unbelievers have no part in it, they being unworthy "to obtain" it, and so they perish utterly. May all lovers of Jesus faithfully labor to lead sinners unto him, and thus swell the number of them who shall, through the Son, obtain the priceless gift.

CHAPTER XII.

THE WICKED SHALL BE DESTROYED.

WEBSTER defines the term destroy—"To unbuild; to pull down; to break up the structure and organic existence of; to ruin; to bring to nought; to put an end to; to annihilate."

Destroy and destruction are many times used in the sacred Scriptures with reference to men, and when so used they mean deprivation of life; their meaning is directly opposed to preservation of life. Like "perish," when they are applied to wicked men, they denote extirpation. Of such as make not God their strength; but trust in the abundance of their riches, and strengthen themselves in wickedness, it is said: "God shall likewise destroy thee for ever: he shall take thee away, and pluck thee out of thy dwelling place, and root thee out of the land of the living."—Psa. lii. 5. When a man is removed out of the "land of the living," and destroyed for ever, he surely cannot be alive. Thus a destroyed person cannot be a living one.

Psa. cxlv. 20: "The Lord preserveth all them that love him: but all the wicked will he destroy."

Here it is plainly stated that God will *preserve* the faithful, but the wicked He will *destroy*. The objector will say, this has reference to the present state; the righteous are preserved and prospered, while the wicked are abased and their counsels brought to nought. But can that be the meaning of the inspired language? That the ungodly very frequently glorify themselves, and triumph throughout life is a known fact, and

abundantly recognized. The psalmist himself says, "How long shall the wicked triumph? How long shall they utter and speak hard things? and all the workers of iniquity boast themselves? They break in pieces thy people, O Lord, and afflict thine heritage." Thus we see that then, as now, the machinations of enemies of God were by no means always rendered fruitless; but were often permitted to triumph until death put an end to them. It is the final condition that is spoken of: the righteous are preserved in death, *i. e.*, redeemed from it, but the wicked are *destroyed* for ever in death.

But it is sometimes objected that "destruction" and "perish," are sometimes used in Scripture with reference to the righteous as well as to the wicked, or with reference to both indiscriminately. This is true, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, and the fact settles it that the terms cannot mean everlasting misery, for no one will contend that the righteous are consigned to that. An intelligent and earnest Bible student must refuse to recognize some plain facts before he can fail to see that while it is true that these terms, when applied to the wicked, as wicked, inevitably imply that they shall not be re-established, but shall remain destroyed, yet when they are applied to men generally they do not preclude a re-establishment, a re-living. Should not Omnipotent Power be exercised on behalf of any dead, none would ever live again; but sacred pages teem with promises of a resurrection of all the worthy ones, a re-living of every righteous son and daughter of Adam.

But not so with the unrighteous; for "when the wicked spring as the grass, and when all the workers

of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be destroyed *for ever*."—Psa. xcii. 7. "He that, being often reproved, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy."—Prov. xxix. 1. The destruction of the ungodly is *without remedy:* but the resurrection furnishes a remedy for the death and destruction of the righteous. Like him who became the first-fruits of the resurrection harvest, they shall not be *holden of death*, for he who has power over death has announced his purpose to open its gates and let *his people* go free. They "shall be raised incorruptible," and the righteous living at that time "shall be changed" to incorruption; "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." When this has transpired, death will have been "swallowed up in victory." Then, looking down into empty graves and upon a conquered foe, there shall ascend from the redeemed ones the triumphant shout, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" What of the wicked then? Theirs is the blackness of darkness forever: their *end* is destruction.

The difference in the destiny of the two classes is clearly set forth in the word of God, spoken by the prophet Isaiah. He says: "O Lord our God, other lords beside thee have had dominion over us: but by thee only will we make mention of thy name." "They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise: therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish." Now mark the contrast. Those wicked ones that "have had dominion" are dead, *they shall not live;* they are deceased, *they shall not rise,* therefore, because this is so,

because they are not to live again, God has visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to *perish; but* "Thy dead men *shall live*, together with my dead body *shall they arise*. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust," etc.

How unmistakable and emphatic is this language. No ambiguity: all is plainly expressed. Yet, clear as it is, were it at variance with the general tenor of Scripture teaching; did a literal construction contradict other well understood portions of Scripture, we would feel bound either to give it a different interpretation, or let it alone entirely. But the fact is it is in perfect harmony not only with the *general tenor* of Scripture inculcation, but with *all* well understood inspired testimony bearing on the subject. Hence to interpret it literally is a necessity. To do otherwise is to wander from the path of safety, incur great danger, and, therefore, to commit a grave error.

Psa. xxxvii. 38: "But the transgressors shall be destroyed together: the end of the wicked shall be cut off."

If, as is claimed, the real and responsible man is a separate entity which continues to exist in a conscious state, then, whether happy or miserable, transgressors are not *destroyed;* nor can they at all be said to be *cut off*, if they have (or rather are) immortal souls which exist separately from the organization. The fact is the text is one of the strongest in the whole Bible. The term rendered *destroyed* is *shomad*, which means *annihilated*. Transgressors shall be annihilated. Thus we can comprehend the full import of the phrase *cut off*.

"For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be." If they shall *not be* they surely must first be destroyed. And this is true, for "evil-doers shall be *cut off*;" so of course they *shall not be.*

We have heretofore shown that God's promises to His people that they shall inherit a certain land necessitates a resurrection from the dead. Hence the Spirit declares: "Wait on the Lord, and keep his way, and he shall exalt thee to inherit the land" (the land promised to Abraham and his seed, but which that patriarch never possessed a foot of): "when the wicked are *cut off*, thou shalt see it."—ver. 34. "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright: for the end of that man is peace."—ver. 37. The *end* of the perfect man is peace in the confident assurance that, being heir to the promise, he will be raised from the dead. Now mark the contrast. But "the *end* of the wicked shall be *cut off*." The end of one is peace in the faith of a future life, while the other is "cut off." So explicit is the language of inspiration, it would seem impossible to misapprehend it. But alas! the mischievous phantom of inherent immortality is ever on the alert, turning its victims away from the truth.

Prov. xiii. 13: "Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed: but he that feareth the commandment shall be rewarded."

Destruction is the end of all despisers of the word. "As the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness. . . Because they have cast away the law of the Lord of hosts." The Spirit declares that God "*preserveth not* the life of the wicked." Modern theology declares, on

the contrary, that God *does preserve* the life of the wicked for the purpose and *only* for the purpose of tormenting them forever, permitting, as ages upon ages roll away, no ray of light or hope to reach them. *As* the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, *so* shall the wicked be destroyed forever.

God has said concerning the enemies of His people, "For yet a very little while, and the indignation shall cease, and mine anger in their destruction."—Isa. x. 25. He further declares that He "bringeth the princes to nothing." The destruction of God's enemies, then, is equivalent to their being brought to *nothing;* and when that state is reached His anger ceases, a thing which could not be truly said if He continues forever to be angry with His enemies, and to preserve their existence for the purpose of displaying His anger by tormenting them. What a fearful and unjustifiable departure from the truth is the theory that God's anger will never cease: that He will take pleasure in tormenting His enemies forever, the glorified saints all the while delighting in the agonies of those most dear to them in this life. Oh what a libel is it upon the character of a just, all-good, all-loving Father! He will not do that terrible thing. No, no, His anger will cease in their destruction.

Isa. xl. 23. "That bringeth the princes to nothing. The Heb. here is, to *ain*, nothing: *bl*, in 38: 17, is defined the same, nothing: and they are both also defined, not; which includes, says Ges, under *ain*, the substantive verb to be, exist; making not to be, not to exist. *Theology of Bible.*

Jer. x. 24: "O Lord, correct me, but with judgment; not in thine anger, lest thou bring me to nothing." Thus

it is seen that the prophet believed God sometimes brings men to *nothing*. Few will deny that to be brought to nothing is to be made an end of, as the psalmist declares, Psa. ix. 5., "Thou hast rebuked the heathen, thou hast destroyed the wicked, thou hast put out their name forever and ever."

"For destruction from God was a terror to me."—Job xxxi. 23. That, then, which was a terror to Job was not eternal misery but *destruction*. Poor, misguided Job (if popular theology were true), thus to be terrified at something which could not possibly happen to him. Our friends of the torment school will take notice that fear of "destruction" does exercise a restraining influence. Destruction is the *end* of all sinners. "And the destruction of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together, and they that forsake the Lord shall be consumed."—Isa. i. 28. All this being the tenor of O. T. Scriptures concerning the ungodly, very many more passages might be adduced, but we forbear and proceed to the

NEW TESTAMENT.

Matt. vii. 13, 14: "Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life; and few there be that find it."

The Saviour here puts "life" and "destruction" in contrast. As, beyond all reasonable question, life means life, and not something entirely different, it follows inevitably that destruction, standing in contrast to life, involves complete cessation of living existence.

Matt. x. 28: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (both life and being in gehenna).

Referring the reader to chapter ii. of this work, where this passage is treated at length, we confidently place it in the list of texts which teach the destructibility of the whole man. It is said that God is *able* to destroy the whole being of man, and He has also declared that He *will* destroy the persistently rebellious. "And ye shall do no work in that same day; for it is a day of atonement, to make an atonement for you before the Lord your God. . . . And whatsoever soul it be that doeth any work in that same day, the same soul will I *destroy* from among the people."—Lev. xxiii. 28–30. And again: "It shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be *distroyed* from among the people."—Acts iii. 23.

Phil. iii. 18, 19: "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ; whose *end* is *destruction.*"

Here we have it again distinctly stated that the end of the wicked is destruction. Destruction, say some of our friends of the torment faith, here means eternal misery; that *it* is the end of the impenitent. What profound reasoning! A person is born into the world, lives out a few years of iniquity, and then passes into a state of terrible suffering, there to be continued forever: and that, it is claimed, is the *end* of him, although he is to have no end, and hence may be said to have yet hardly begun to exist. Thus, too,

untold millions of ages are made the *end* of a few years. How extremely preposterous! When ten times ten thousand years have rolled away his existence would, comparatively speaking, have but just begun; and yet men who are rational on other subjects talk about an eternity of misery being the *end* of sinners. We know of nothing in all the world more absurd than the plea that an eternity of living existence is the *end* of a man.

It may be objected to this that Paul speaks of an "end" being "everlasting life." True, but he does not say the end of believers is everlasting life. He says to the church at Rome, "What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of these things is *death*." (Not so, says modern theology, the end of these things is eternal life in misery. Thus they contradict Paul.) "But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." The apostle simply and plainly affirms that the end or fruit of unrighteousness is death; while the end or fruit of righteousness is everlasting life. In the passage under consideration it is *persons* whose end is declared to be destruction. The uniform testimony of inspiration is that the end of all enemies of Christ is death, destruction. Very strong evidence of the error of popular theology on this subject is the fact that in order to sustain itself it is compelled to attach to plain words a meaning in no sense their own, thus purposely mystifying what God has made clear.

2 Thess. i. 9: "Who shall be punished with everlast-

ing destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power."

The subjects of this punishment are such as "know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." If the wicked exist forever in a state of misery, and, as is affirmed, God will be present exerting his power in tormenting them forever, they being thus made to always feel and acknowledge the might and glory of his power, then who, pray tell us, does not see that the language, "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power," is sheer nonsense? Does the Spirit thus utter worse than meaningless words? Let them who insist upon an exposition which involves such an imputation beware lest they come into condemnation, for believers must stand before the judgment seat of Christ.

According to the theory we oppose there is *no such thing* as being destroyed "from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." But as "the wages of sin is death," and sinners shall be punished with *utter destruction*, then when they are put back into nothingness, from whence they were taken, they will be removed from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. In no other way will they be. There can be no such thing as consciousness beyond the glory of God's power, for it is by His sustaining power that all things exist. But the word of God is true. Wicked people will be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord. Surely the truth is so plain none who desire to see it can well fail to do so.

1 Thess. v. 3: "For when they shall say, Peace and safety; then sudden *destruction* cometh upon them." If this is not destruction at all but unending suffering, then it could not properly be said to be sudden, for how would it sound to say, "then sudden eternal torment cometh upon them?"

Phil. i. 28: "And in nothing terrified by your adversaries: which is to them an evident token of perdition, but to you of salvation, and that of God." The Syriac reads: "And in nothing be ye startled, by those who rise up against us; (which is) an indication of their *destruction*, and of *life* for you." Destruction and life are again found contrasted. Destruction, therefore, is the opposite of life; it is abiding in death. Archbishop Newcombe says of the passage: "Which constancy, as it shows the truth of that Gospel which ye believe, is to your adversaries a proof that they deserve *destruction* for rejecting it, and for persisting in their vices." See also Mark xii. 9; Luke xvii. 26–30; xx. 16; Rom. ix. 22; 1Tim. vi. 9; 2 Pet. ii. 1, and many others.

1 Cor. xv. 26: "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

Every enemy, then, is to be *destroyed*, death being the last one. But how can this be if enemies of God are never to be destroyed but continued forever. Bishop Whately remarks: "We are told by Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 25, that Christ 'must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet,' and that the 'last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.' And this does not seem consistent with the *continuance forever* of a vast number of wicked beings, alive and hating Christ, and odious

in his sight." Truly it does not. There is no way of harmonizing popular faith on this question with the inspired testimony of Paul.

THE DOOM OF THE IMPENITENT IS DEATH.

Directing attention to our remarks concerning death, (chap. i.,) as the penalty of the law, the wages of sin, we must regard it as a proved position that the Scripture use of "death," in such connection, is *extinction of life* True, theology gives it another meaning in such cases, but in all instances where theology differs with the word of God, we prefer the latter. Paul, writing to the Romans, and referring to certain ones who were guilty of many dark sins, says: "Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of *death*."—Rom. i. 32. Some will insist, notwithstanding the very frequent testimony of inspiration to the contrary, and never at all in favor, that almost countless millions of the finally impenitent will forever suffer indescribable agony; and others that a time will come when the sins of all mankind, not excepting the most rebellious, will be expunged, and all who have ever lived be redeemed to God, but here, in all the power of its divine emanation, stands the solemn declaration of Paul, "that they which commit such things are *worthy of death*."

Rom. vi. 16: "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of *sin unto death*, or of. obedience unto righteousness?"

Rom. vi. 21 and 23: "What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the *end* of those things is *death*. For the wages of sin is

death; but the gift of God is *eternal life,* through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Rom. vii. 5: "For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sin, which were by the law, did work in our members, to bring forth fruit unto *death.*" See also Rom. viii. 13. Surely no Bible student can fail to see how plainly the word of God teaches that "the soul that sinneth *it* shall *die.*"

Reader, dost thou live after the flesh? Dost thou grieve the Spirit of grace, yielding obedience to fleshly lusts? Then this know, that thou hast no life in thyself other than a mere animal one, and if when that ends thou hast failed to lay hold on the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, thine must be the blackness of darkness forever. There can be no comparison between a life running through a few short years of sinful pleasure here, and that life of unalloyed happiness extending along the unbroken ages of eternity, and which God would have you obtain upon the simple conditions imposed. Were your whole life one of faithful service you would simply render to God His due, and eternal life would still be a gift. You would still be indebted to Him for *all* that "exceeding and eternal weight of glory" which they shall experience who have part in the resurrection at the coming of Jesus.

Remember what God has done for you. Remember the humiliation, labors and sufferings of Christ, his degradation and poverty, how he "that was rich became poor for our sakes" that we "through his poverty might be rich," and then say if this "great salvation" is not of more value than all things else beside. Life and death are set before you. One or the other

must be your destiny; the choice is with yourself. To the one you are rapidly tending; to the other the Son of God has made it easy for you to attain. If you choose the better part, "when Christ, who is our life, shall appear," you will be accounted worthy to "appear with him in glory." But if you serve self, you will die as the fool dieth; and when the righteous are glorified you will be left in death as too vile and corrupt a thing to have any place either in heaven or on all the earth. Think, then, what God has done and proposes to do for you. He has given His own Son and asks you to believe on him. O, then, give yourself entirely to Him. Believe, repent, obey.

Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap. "For he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap *corruption*" (death); "but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap *life* everlasting."—Gal. vi. 8.

CHAPTER XIII.

DEVOURED, CONSUMED.

It is sometimes said of the wicked that they will be devoured, and sometimes that they will be consumed. We again quote from *Bible vs. Tradition:*

"The word devour, to eat up, when applied to the wicked, implies their total consumption and annihilation. Lev. x. 2: 'There went out fire from the Lord, and *devoured* them, and they *died* before the Lord.' Jer. ii 30: 'Your own sword hath devoured your prophets, like a destroying lion.' Devour here implies death, and destruction by fire or sword. Ps. xxi. 8, 9: 'Thine hand shall find out all thine enemies. Thou shalt make

them as a fiery oven in the time of thine anger: the Lord shall swallow them up in his wrath, and the fire shall *devour* them.' Isa. x. 16: 'Therefore shall the Lord, the Lord of hosts, send among his fat ones leanness; and under his glory he shall kindle a burning like the burning of a fire. And the light of Israel shall be for a fire, and his Holy One for a flame: and it shall burn and devour his thorns and his briers (the wicked) in one day; and shall consume the glory of his forest, and of his fruitful field, *both soul and body*, (life and being,) and they shall be as when a standard-bearer (*koloh*) is consumed,' Isa. xxvi. 11: 'Yea the fire of thine enemies shall devour them.' Isa. xxxiii. 11: 'Ye shall conceive chaff, ye shall bring forth stubble; your breath as fire shall devour you; and the people shall be as the burnings of lime; as thorns cut up shall they be burned in the fire.' 14 v.: 'The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites, Who among us shall dwell (or live) with the devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell (or live) with everlasting burnings?' Says Paul, 'How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?' All these questions imply the impossibility of escape, for it is impossible for him to dwell (or live) in a devouring or everlasting fire without being consumed. Can a devouring fire fail to devour its fuel? If it devours, it must consume the wicked. Everlasting, in this place, means lasting till the fuel be entirely consumed. Heb. x. 27, There remaineth to the wicked, 'A certain fearful looking for judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.' Nahum i. 8: 'Darkness shall pursue his enemies. What do ye imagine against the Lord? he will make an *utter end:* affliction shall not rise up *a second time.* For a while they be folded together as thorns, and while they are drunken as drunkards, they shall be devoured as stubble fully dry.' Rev. xx. 9: 'A fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured

them.' See also Psa. l. 9; lxxvi. 7; Jer. v. 14. Here are eleven times that the word *devour* is applied to the end of the wicked. After sinners are devoured, we see not how even God himself could inflict more punishment upon them without raising them again to life; but such sure work will God make with sinners that it will not be necessary to afflict them *a second time.*

"THE WICKED WILL BE CONSUMED.

"Consume, in its application to the wicked, implies to waste away; to cause to pass away; to bring to utter ruin; to exterminate; to burn up. But we will see its Bible exposition. In the O. T. it is *koloh,* to consume, finish, come to an end. Ex. xv. 7: 'Thou sentest forth thy wrath, which consumed them as stubble.' Here Pharaoh and his host were consumed by being drowned in the sea. Num. xvii. 13: 'Whoso cometh . . near . . the tabernacle . . shall die: shall be consumed with dying.' Psa. lxxi. 13: 'Let them be confounded and consumed that are adversaries to my soul.' Isa. i. 28; 'The destruction of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together, and they that forsake the Lord shall be consumed.' Isa. v. 24: 'As the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust; because they have cast away the law of the Lord.' Zep. i. 2: 'I will utterly consume all things from off the land, saith the Lord, I will *consume man* and beast; I will consume the fowls of the heaven, and the fishes of the sea, and the stumbling-blocks with the wicked; and I will cut off man from off the land, saith the Lord.' Isa. xlvii. 14: 'Behold they (the astrologers) shall be as stubble; the fire shall burn them; they shall not deliver their *souls* (original and margin,) from the power of the flame.' Their souls then being under the power of the flame, will surely be consumed. But their souls, means themselves. Granted. They will be ut-

terly consumed, soul and being. See also, Deut. iv. 24; 1 Sam. xxii. 25; Job iv. 8, 9; xv. 34; xx. 26; Psa. lxxxv. 3; Isa. x. 22, 23; xvi. 4; xxviii. 22; xxix. 20; l. 9.

"Here are twenty times that the Bible plainly declares the wicked shall be consumed in destruction This cannot be made compatible with continued existence in misery."

How very strange is it that men persist in closing their eyes and hearts to such plainly expressed truth? But christendom is beginning to learn. Very many will yet receive and boldly teach the great truth that God is indeed a God of love, and that He will not preserve sinners and torment them, but will have a universe free from everything which will not praise His great and holy name. The many, however, even of Christians, will most likely continue to sit in darkness until the glorious appearing of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to establish his kingdom with justice and with judgment and reign forever.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE WICKED WILL BE BURNED.

As sacred history distinctly informs us that many of the wicked have in the past been destroyed by fire, so various portions of Scripture clearly show that very many, at least, of the wicked who are alive at the coming of Christ will be destroyed by the agency of fire, either in conflagration or the no less destructive fire of war. It is said of the "sons of Belial" that they "shall be all of them as thorns thrust away," and "shall be utterly burned with fire." If, like thorns

cast into the flame, they were *utterly burned* with fire they surely cannot be still unburned.

Mal. iv. 1: "For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall *burn them up*, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them *neither root nor branch*."

Those who hold that the wicked will be eternally preserved in their sin and shame, will pardon the thought that the best way for them to "dispose of" this text is to *believe* it. There have been various attempts to weaken or remove altogether the force of the language, but they have not been sufficiently reasonable to command the serious attention of men conversant with the Scriptures touching the subject.

How can a person more directly contradict God than by affirming that the wicked will live forever, always hating and blaspheming, when He has so emphatically declared of some that they shall be burned up? The term used by way of comparison, renders it quite conclusive that *utter destruction* and not *preservation* is meant, for stubble is not preserved when put in the fire: it is consumed. Mr. George, like some others of the common faith, does not believe the language of the text implies the destruction, the "annihilation" of the wicked referred to, but that it refers to the "judgment day." We quite agree with him that it represents the judgment of those to whom it directly refers but how can that indicate that literal destruction is not meant? His theory does not concede that the wicked will at "the judgment" be so completely consumed that there shall be left of "them neither root nor

branch," so he finds it convenient to have it refer only to what is termed the judgment day. But as he and those of the popular theory contend that the whole being of the wicked will from thence forever be *preserved* in order to be tormented, they still put themselves in a position of direct antagonism to the testimony of inspiration. All will see that such a position is totally at variance with the word of God. We think it not unlikely that the prophecy has reference in part to the great destruction of the Jews by the Romans. That day was most assuredly their judgment.

The wonderful thought is conceived that if the prophecy refers to the final judgment, as it is called, then it is opposed to our position, for as we do not believe that the wicked dead will have a resurrection, *all* the proud and wicked will not then be burned up root and branch. Even upon the supposition that the language has particular reference to the judgment that shall take place at the coming of Christ, this objection is purely imaginary, for the language neither sustains it nor renders it reasonable. There is nothing about the text to suggest the thought, much less compel the conclusion that the wicked dead are to be raised for the purpose of being destroyed again. When the judgment commences *then* all (the then living) that do wickedly will be as stubble, not all who *have* (throughout the past) *done* wickedly. We find it difficult to believe that our author himself attaches any weight to his objection, in view of the whole text. We care not whether the language be held to have reference to a judgment now in the past, or to one yet future; in either case the complete destruction of sinners is foretold.

Dr. Adam Clarke admits that the expression *shall leave them neither root nor branch,* was a "proverbial" one "for total destruction." If the wicked are totally destroyed, there is neither "root nor branch" left; but if they are preserved it is simply folly to say they are destroyed, *root* and *branch.* The fact is the text is so plain any attempt to tamper with it is wholly inexcusable.

The Spirit declares concerning the Lord, "A fire goeth before him, and burneth up his enemies round about."—Psa. xcvii. 3. It is also said, "And the strong shall be as tow, and the maker of it as a spark, and they shall both *burn* together, and none shall quench them."—Isa. i. 31. All are well aware that when tow is set on fire it is burned up, utterly consumed. The Saviour declared that in the great harvest, at the end of the world, he "will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles and burn them." It cannot be reasonably claimed that the wicked, since Jesus has compared their final destiny to the destruction of tares by fire, are never to be really destroyed. Were the common theory concerning them true, the comparison would be altogether inadequate and improper.

Matt. iii. 11, 12: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, . . . he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire. Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner; but he will *burn up* the chaff with unquenchable fire."

Chaff here represents the wicked. It is said they

will be separated from the wheat, the righteous, and be *burned up* with *unquenchable fire.* Is there any thing about the expression "unquenchable fire" which indicates that the fire is never to go out? Certainly not. It is unquenchable because it cannot be *quenched,* but continues to burn until it consumes that which it burns. A house takes fire and, despite all efforts to save it, is consumed. They who did all in their power to save the property are asked if they could not have subdued the flames. Their reply is, "No, the fire was unquenchable." This was true; the fire was unquenchable, yet it went out of itself when it had consumed the house. A writer truly says:

"But, continues the objector, 'The fire that burns up the wicked is called 'eternal fire,' and their punishment is called 'eternal damnation.' We reply, 1. That it is called a *consuming fire* and a *devouring fire;* and if it consumes and devours it must utterly destroy the wicked. 2. Supposing that the word *aionas,* translated '*eternal,*' meant what the English word imports, without beginning and without end — which it certainly does not, and which the reader will see when we discuss the meaning of this word—even when taken in the broadest sense contended for, it can imply no more than that the instrument of destruction is everlasting. To say that a fire will continue to burn what it does not consume, is a solecism in language. If pure gold is indestructible in fire, then it cannot be burned; if the wicked are indestructible, they can neither be burned nor injured by fire. 3. Everlasting fire, or fire lasting till it has utterly consumed its fuel, is an appropriate emblem of total and everlasting destruction. If the fire were not to last thus long, some vestiges of the wicked, such as bones, which are the most indestructible, might possibly remain. And 4. We re-

ply, that in Heb. vi. 2, we read of 'eternal judgment,' and this and 'eternal fire,' only mean that in both cases, it will be final, the results will be everlasting; the wicked will continue burned up; they will never rise again; they will be consumed, annihilated, exterminated; they will remain under the power of death forever; and as men, they will be as though they had never been. It is frivolous to tell us that the elementary principles will remain; we know that, but we know too that as living men or beings they will not be. Ashes and gases are not conscious beings, and to such things the wicked will be reduced."

It is written that the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah "are set forth as an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." — Jude vii. What happened to those cities? They, together with their inhabitants, were *burned up,* consumed. They are said to have suffered "the vengeance of eternal fire." But does the fire still continue? No, it ceased thousands of years since; it came to an end when it had consumed that which was subjected to it. And the inhabitants of those places are said to have suffered the vengeance of eternal fire, because the effect of the fire, destruction, is eternal, hence those wicked people will never have any future life. They are totally destroyed, and in this they are an example unto others. God, by "turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an example unto those that after should live ungodly." If the Sodomites are now in some secret place suffering torment, they cannot be a *pattern* to others, for no such state is spoken of; but their destruction by fire is an ex-

ample, or pattern to others, and as such it clearly sets forth the doom of the ungodly.

Other Scripture testimony might be adduced, in corroboration of what we have written, to show that the wicked will be destroyed, many of them, by the agency of fire, but enough has, we think, been said on this point. That the wicked will all cease to be is the uniform testimony of inspiration. "The wages of sin is *death*," literal death. "The soul that sinneth it shall *die*." The *end* of those things is "*death*." "When lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death."—James i. 15.

Dr. Whedon, Methodist, in his New Testament commentary, only a part of which is yet published, writing on Rom. vi. 23, says:

"WAGES OF SIN—The hire which the master Sin pays to his servants is DEATH. And this *death*, the antithesis of ETERNAL LIFE, and measured in duration by it, is *eternal death*, *death* that knows no resurrection. The reverse, ETERNAL LIFE, the result of the service of Jesus Christ our Lord, is not a WAGES, but a free and bounteous GIFT."

The wages of sin is death; and if men die in their sins, theirs is *eternal death*, death that knows no resurrection.

CHAPTER XV.

WHAT POPULAR THEOLOGY DOES WITH SINNERS.

HAVING shown what the Bible teaches respecting the future of the finally impenitent, we will now briefly consider the disposition which orthodoxy would make of them, and the reader will have no difficulty in determining whether its theory is justified by revelation, or is a purely human invention. Orthodoxists differ somewhat as to the degree and kind of suffering to which the wicked are subjected, but they agree that all enemies of God are consigned to a place termed hell, where they will be tormented to all eternity. Hell is a term formerly in common use, and its signification was wholly unlike the awful meaning given it by modern theology. Dr. Adam Clarke says:

"The word *hell* comes from the *Anglo-Saxon*, helan, *to cover* or *hide*, hence the *tiling* or *slating* of a house is called, in some parts of England, (particularly in Cornwall) *heling* to this day; and the covers of books (in Lancashire) by the same name."

The author of "Bible *vs.* Tradition" remarks concerning the term:

"It is of Saxon origin, and is derived from the verb *helan*, and was spelled *hele, helle, hell,* heil and *helan.* It meant, to hele, or to hell, heal, hill, shell, hulk, shovel, shiel, shield, shawl, *i. e.*, to cover up, to hide. The word in its primitive form is still retained in the *eastern* and especially the *western* counties of England; and means something hidden or covered, the grave. To *hele* over a thing is to *cover* it. The word *hell* is still retained in the English liturgy, according to the old English translation of *sheol,* in Psa. xlix. 14; lxxxviii. 3;

lxxxix. 49; it is now altered in those places to *grave*. Those who wish to trace this word *hell* to its origin may consult Lord *King's* History of the Creed, ch. iv.; *Doddridge* on Rev., i. 18; *Leigh's* Crit. Sacr. in haides; and *Junius'* Etymology, Anglican in *Heile* and *hele*."

The word is found fifty-two times in the common English translation, and is so rendered from the word *sheol* of the Old Testament, and *hades*, *gehenna*, and *tartarus*, of the New Testament. Since the word had not at that time any such meaning as a place of conscious suffering, it is not unfair to suppose that the translators merely meant by it the grave, the concealed or unseen place, sometimes the state of death, and sometimes, perhaps, the process of punishing with death combined with the state of death. Certain it is that in no one of the fifty-two instances of its use does it mean a place where the wicked are tormented, or a place of long-continued suffering of any kind.

Sheol, the only word in the Old Testament translated hell, is three times rendered *pit*, thirty times *grave*, and thirty-one times *hell*. *Sheol* is, therefore, rendered hell a less number of times than it is *pit* and *grave*. The reader will bear in mind that the term has the same general meaning, no matter by what English word it is represented. One of the Old Testament texts relied on to support the modern idea of retribution, is Psa. ix. 17: "The wicked shall be turned into hell (*sheol*) and all the nations that forget God." Of course the text does not at all favor the torment theory except as the word *hell* is associated in the mind with a place of

torture. Just as reasonably might the following texts be claimed in support of that theory.

Job xiv. 13: "Oh that thou wouldst hide me in the grave (*sheol*), that thou wouldst keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldst appoint me a set time, and remember me." None will be so extremely absurd as to suppose that Job desired to go to a place of torments, the theological hell. Again: Job xvii. 13 and 16: "If I wait, the grave (*sheol*) is mine house. . . . They shall go down to the bars of the pit (*sheol*), when our rest together is in the dust." Job, then, desired to go to *sheol* because he believed he would there rest in freedom from his many sorrows, and that God would "remember" him in due time—in the resurrection morning.

During the reign of Hezekiah God sent Isaiah the prophet to him with this message: "Thus saith the Lord, Set thine house in order: for thou shalt die, and not live."—Isa. xxxviii. The good old king was not well pleased with the message, and he immediately began to pray that he might be spared yet longer, a rather strange proceeding on his part if he expected to go to glory at death. His prayer being answered, and fifteen years added to his life, he tells how he felt in the near prospect of death. "I said, in the cutting off of my days, I shall go to the gates of the grave (*sheol*).' Did the man who could say, "Remember now, O Lord, I beseech thee, how I have walked before thee in truth, and with a perfect heart, and have done that which is good in thy sight," expect, in the event of death, to be consigned to a place of torment? Impossible! He praised God for answering his prayer and keeping

him longer out of sheol, "the pit of corruption," and declared: "For the grave (*sheol*) cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee." So while it is altogether improper to suppose Hezekiah at that time anticipated should he die, an entrance into a place of suffering, it is equally improper to maintain, since he affirms to the contrary, that he expected to be conscious in death, for, good man as he was, if he was conscious he would certainly praise God. He believed, as it is written, that there is no "device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave (*sheol*)."

But let us go further back. When Jacob saw what he thought was conclusive evidence of Joseph's death, he said: "I will go down into the grave (*sheol*) unto my son mourning." — Gen. xxxvii. 35. And when, some years later, the brethren, at Joseph's command, would take Benjamin down to Egypt, Jacob said: "If mischief befall him by the way in which ye shall go, then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave (*sheol*)." All know that Jacob was a servant of God. Had *sheol* in all these and other texts been rendered *hell*, nobody would be so simple as to believe that it means a place of misery. By whatever term *sheol* was rendered, it should have been rendered by that term in all the texts where it occurs, for it has always the same general meaning, and is not a place of consciousness.

"What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death? shall he deliver his soul" (himself) "from the hand of the grave (*sheol*)?" — Psa. lxxxix. 48. "For in death there is no *remembrance* of thee: in the grave (*sheol*) who shall give thee thanks?"—Psa. vi. 5. If there is no

remembrance in *sheol*, the state of death, there surely is no consciousness there, and if no consciousness then certainly no suffering.

The word *hell* occurs about twenty-four times in the New Testament. Eleven of these it is rendered from the Greek word *hades*, and twelve times from *gehenna*. (For the meaning of gehenna see ch. ii., of this work.) Hades corresponds with sheol, of the Old Testament, and has the same general import.

The reader will see that the Bible hell is not a place where the wicked are tormented, but that the righteous as well as the wicked go there, the latter to remain forever, and the former to remain until he who has the keys of death and of hell (hades, the grave, the state of the dead) shall set them free; as it is written—"The gates of hell shall not prevail against "my church." If none of the righteous—no members of Christ's church go into hell (hades), what propriety is there in the assurance of Christ that it shall not prevail against his church. The language affirms, by implication, that the members of Christ's church are subject to the power of hell (hades, the state of death), but as it will finally be overcome and destroyed, so far as his church is concerned, it will not *prevail* against them. It will, however, prevail against Christ's enemies, for he has neither promised nor threatened to deliver them from it.

Let us now see how strangely the theological hell contrasts with the Bible one. Mr. Benson will doubtless be regarded good Methodist authority on the subject, he being recognized as a standard writer on Methodism. Hear his description. He says:

God is present in hell in his infinite justice, and Almighty wrath, as an unfathomable sea of liquid fire, where the wicked must drink in *everlasting torture.* The presence of God in his vengeance, scatters darkness and woe through the dreary regions of misery. As heaven would be no heaven if God did not there manifest his love; so hell would be no hell if God did not there display His wrath. It is the presence of God which gives everything virtue and efficacy; without which there can be no life, no sensibility, no power. God is therefore himself present in hell to see the punishment of those rebels against his government, that it may be adequate to the infinitude of their guilt. His fiery indignation kindles, and his incensed fury feeds the flames of their torments; while his powerful presence and operation maintains their being, and renders all their powers most acutely sensible; thus setting the keenest edge upon their pain, and making it cut most intolerably deep. He will exert all his divine attributes to make them as wretched as the capacity of their being will admit."

Reader, do not turn carelessly away, saying, "This is a Methodist view of hell; no others hold such views concerning it." One of America's most eminent divines, a theologian and a scholar, speaking of hell, said:

"But to help your conception, imagine yourselves to be cast into a fiery oven, all of a glowing heat, or into the midst of a glowing brick kiln, or a great furnace; imagine also, that your body was to be there a quarter of an hour, full of fire, as full within and without as a bright coal of fire, all the while full of quick sense, how long would that quarter of an hour seem to you? . . . But what would be the effect on your soul, if you knew you must endure the torments twenty-four hours? How much greater if for a year

for a thousand years! O, then, how would your heart sink if you knew you must endure it forever! That after millions of millions of ages your torment would be no nearer an end than when it began! But your torments in hell will be *immensely greater* than this illustration represents!! . . . The woes of sinners in hell will not be a cause of grief to saints in heaven, but of rejoicing. "This rejoicing will be the fruit of an *amiable disposition*, and a perfect holiness and conformity to Christ. . . After your godly parents shall have seen you lie in hell millions of ages, in torment day and night, they will not begin to pity you then; they will *praise God* that his justice appears in the eternity of your misery."

One of Europe's most eminent living divines says:

"When thou diest thy soul will be tormented alone; that will be a hell for it; but at the day of judgment thy body will join thy soul, and then thou wilt have twin hells; body and soul shall be together, each brimfull of pain, thy soul sweating in its inmost pore drops of blood, and thy body from head to foot suffused with agony; conscience, judgment, memory, all tortured; but more, thy head tormented with racking pains; thine eyes starting from their sockets with sights of blood and woe; thine ears tormented with

> "Sullen moans and hollow groans,
> And shricks of tortured ghosts;"

thine heart beating high with fever; thy pulse rattling at an enormous rate in agony; thy limbs cracking like the martyrs in the fire, and yet unburnt; thyself put in a vessel of hot oil, pained, yet coming out undestoyed; all thy veins becoming a road for the hot feet of pain to travel on; every nerve a string on which the devil shall ever play his diabolical tune of hell's unutterable lament; the soul forever and ever aching, and thy body palpitating in unison with thy soul.

Fictions, sir? Again I say, they are no fictions, and, as God liveth, but solid, stern truth. If God be true and this Bible be true, what I have said is the truth, and you will find it one day to be so.

"There is a real fire in hell as truly as you have a real body—a fire exactly like that we have on earth in everything except this—that it will not consume though it will torment you."

But even worse than all, if that be possible, is this stanza of Dr. Watts:

> "There is a never-ending hell,
> And never dying pains,
> Where *children* must with demons dwell,
> In darkness, fire and chains."

None will doubt the sincerity of the authors of the forgoing descriptions: in the terrible darkness of their ignorance have they spoken. Awful blasphemy it is, and eminently calculated to make men *abhor* the very name of God and religion. The doctrine of inherent immortality is responsible for this blasphemy. All orthodoxists will not admit, of course, the truth of the pictures drawn, but they do agree that hell is a place where the wicked are eternally subjected to excruciating torture. It is not strange that myriads have been compelled to seek refuge in Universalism and Restorationism, and that still more, perhaps, have been driven into the darkness and almost hopelessness of active infidelity. The latter class, not questioning that inherent immortality and eternal torments are taught in the Bible, reject both doctrine and Bible as equally unworthy of belief.

Can it be any wonder that this is so when Christians defend and proclaim a doctrine which turns an all-

loving and long-suffering God into an infinitely more cruel and vindictive tyrant than humanity with all its weaknesses and proneness to cruelty and tyranny ever yet developed? a doctrine which unseats reason and exalts a demon to her throne? No wonder Edwards himself, when thoughts of endlesss misery thronged on him, was so burdened that he would walk "his room for hours together with tears and grief." No wonder that Dr. Albert Barnes had a similar experience, and in the midst of his amazement, perplexities and doubts, exclaimed: "I am struck dumb—it is all dark, dark to my soul, and I cannot disguise it." No wonder Saurin exclaimed:

I sink under the weight of this subject; and I declare, when I see my friends, my relations, the people of my charge—when I think that I, that you, that we all are threatened with these torments—when I see, in the lukewarmness of my devotions, in the languor of my love, in the faintness of my resolutions and designs, the *least evidence* though it be only *probable* or *presumptive*, of my future misery, yet I find in the thought a *mortal poison* which diffuses itself into every period of my life, rendering society tiresome, nourishment insipid, pleasure disgustful, and life itself a cruel bitter—I cease to wonder that a fear of hell has made some melancholy, and others mad." — *Sermon published by The American Tract Society.*

God present in hell feeding "the flames of their torments" with "His incensed fury," and lest the victims of His "wrath" should perish quite, maintains "their being, and renders all their powers more *acutely sensible!*" God exerting his almighty power to preserve the lives of the creatures He has made, and ever at work to

keep them "brimful of pain;" making them sweat in every "pore drops of blood;" suffusing them "with agony" "from head to foot," and torturing their conscience, judgment and memory! God, a Redeemer who shed bitters tears when contemplating the fate of a doomed city, angels and the whole sainted host looking down upon writhing sufferers in hell and rejoicing and taking sweet delight in the spectacle of "the devil" playing "his diabolical tune of hell's unutterable lament" on every sensitive nerve of those they once loved on earth! The redeemed saints, made "perfect in holiness and conformity to Christ," and hence possessing a truly "amiable disposition," thrilled with ecstatic emotions as they behold the eyes of their once loved ones "starting from their sockets with sights of blood and woe," and praising God anew as ever and anon there comes to their ears the sweet, sweet sounds of

> "Sullen moans and hollow groans.
> And shrieks of tortured ghosts!"

Oh, shame, shame on a theory of which such vile and damning stuff is the legitimate offspring! And this is that which many love so well as to declare that if it were not true they "would cease to love God;" they would "serve self and enjoy the pleasures of sin." If in their questionable service they are impelled by such motives, then they are just simply serving self and nothing more. They do what they do for the purpose and *only* for the purpose of keeping out of the fire. Such might as well throw off the mask and serve self openly, for God will not accept their hollow offerings. "Give me thine heart," is the requisition.

It will avail nothing, in attempting to seek relief from the awful responsibility of teaching such a doctrine, to say, "I do not believe in the doctrine of *torture*, but of unhappiness." Eternal unhappiness is eternal torture, and the theory in any form, no matter how modified, represents God as cruel and vindictive.

THE EFFECT OF BELIEVING THE DOCTRINE.

This theory of the destiny of the wicked is believed, professedly, by the major portion of its patrons to possess in an eminent degree the power of restraining men from evil. Few indeed who have thought much on the subject, who have observed closely and considered the various aspects of the question have failed to see that such is not its tendency. Most of those who affirm it to be a salutary doctrine are practical deniers that it is so. Several considerations conspire to justify this conclusion, and among them is the fact that the doctrine is but little preached. That this is so is both undeniable and extensively recognized and acknowledged. Rev. Dr. Curry, editor of the (N. Y.) "Christian Advocate," in an editorial some time since said:

"The doctrine of future retribution" (eternal torments in a theological hell), "above all others, has been permitted to fall out of notice; so much so that a Universalist might be a constant hearer in almost any of our evangelical churches, and very seldom hear his notions interfered with from the pulpit."

Why is it so? In one of two things will be found the true explanation. Either they, like certain heathen who taught a similar doctrine in connection with

immortal-soulism, do not themselves believe it; or else they dare not preach it. While we know the former to be extensively true, we are not without good grounds for believing the latter is also largely true. Well they know the people will not consent to listen to it. So manifestly antagonistic is it to the great central truth of the gospel, "God is love," so at war with all reasonable conceptions of the Divine character, a minister of the gospel could hardly more readily and effectually scatter his flock than by frequently preaching hell torments as preached a few years ago. So those of our self-termed evangelical preachers who believe the doctrine, are like certain chief priests and elders whom our Lord encountered at Jerusalem—they "fear the people," and so permit the whole subject of "future retribution" to "fall out of notice."

What we have on another occasion said on this point we now repeat: Brethren of the Methodist and all other churches, who hold to the torment theory, if you believe the doctrine you *ought to preach it;* if you do not believe it you *ought to renounce it.* You cannot refuse to do either without incurring divine displeasure. As Christian brethren, we exhort you to faithfulness in this matter. What sort of watchmen are you on the walls of Zion? How can you, day after day, go to God in prayer, asking forgiveness while ever renewedly guilty of that awful sin of omission, which surely rests upon you, if, believing some of your fellow-men are daily, hourly passing into everlasting torture, you fail to constantly raise the warning voice? How can you stand before your people and, believing them exposed to such a future, fail to urge it upon their considera-

tion more earnestly and persistently than all things else combined? You may say they already know it. We reply, ordinary minds cannot comprehend it, and your superior abilities in that direction are constantly required to assist them.

If on the other hand you do not believe it, you surely must regard it a gross misrepresentation of the character of God, in which case how can you, in the name of him who in boundless love was given, invoke Divine favor while before the world you countenance and support the libel? In either case your error is not simply error; it is a deep, dark sin. Therefore look well to your duty in this thing.

The fact is, as a restrainer from evil the doctrine is an ignominious failure. Though it has for centuries been preached in various forms and degrees, much of the time in its most horrible form, the world is to-day worse than ever. So contemptuous is it of everything like true Christian religion; so mad and reckless its course of folly and sin; so many and diabolical its crimes, even the ungodly themselves stand aghast, wondering what will next develope. In view of these facts, that is strange logic which involves the conclusion that its effects upon the world are salutary, especially, as we have seen, it has been found to be so unsalutary that it has, so far as preaching it is concerned, "been permitted to fall out of notice."

Eminently salutary is it? Go to every prison-house and visit every drunkard, gambler, forger, robber, seducer, murderer; nay, traverse our beautiful land from centre to circumference, finding out every villain of every kind and grade, whipped and un

whipped of justice, and when you have asked every one the question you will have learned that *nearly all* are believers not only in the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, but also in the torment theory. Where, then, is its boasted power to restrain men from the commission of evil? Ask the thousands of weak, emaciated, heart-broken wives and mothers who are compelled to toil night and day, through sickness and health, to keep gaunt starvation from laying its rude hand upon their puny and half-naked little ones, and who not unfrequently at last, with them, fall victims to murderous attacks by infuriated demons who pass for husbands, as they reel home from midnight carousals, crazed by infernal poisons, the traffic in which is legalized and protected by the laws of Christian lands. And then, if still you doubt, go ask the "300,000 members," which, a competent and reliable authority declares, the churches of the United Kingdom have lost by the vice of intemperance during the past three years. The astounding wickedness, probably never so great as now, throughout *all* christendom, is an overwhelming reply to the assumption that the doctrine is salutary.

The majority of people, perhaps, make no attempt to comprehend or believe the doctrine of eternal torments, and upon their ears its presentation falls as so many meaningless words. Those who are seriously affected by it may be divided into two classes, first: they who perceive the inexpressible cruelty and vindictiveness it imputes to the Creator, and, not knowing the Bible does not teach it, reject both it and the Bible, and plunge into the dark sea of infidelity; and second: they who by it are frightened into a profession of re-

ligion. In its influence upon very many of this latter class, is seen some of the most deplorable effects of teaching the doctrine. When men have been frightened into the form of serving Christ, they soon begin to contemplate with some degree of calmness their new experience. They cannot then fully believe God will inflict such objectless punishment upon His creatures, and so, their fears becoming allayed, they turn their backs upon the Church and again go to the world, plunging the more deeply into its follies from having, as they suppose, tried religion and found it a bauble.

People are denounced as infidels for merely denying the immortality of the soul, notwithstanding no salutary quality can be claimed for belief in it except as it is associated with future misery; and the only salutary quality that can be claimed for *that* consists in its power of appeal to the passion of fear—fear of suffering. A mere abject, slavish submission may be compelled on the part of some individuals, by appealing to the passion of fear, but willing, hearty obedience can only be secured through the influence of love. Cowardly people are sometimes frightened into cold conformity to divine requirements; but if, when the excitement of mind is allayed, they do not return, like the "sow to her wallowing in the mire," to that course from which their love was never really withdrawn, it is because some favoring circumstances enable them to look through the dark, repulsive cloud in which fear has enveloped them, and to see beyond it some beauty in the Lord that they should desire him. We hold it axiomatic that fear of torment is not a worthy motive to obedience. It incites no love, and a religion without love is lifeless.

Love and fear are directly opposite in their effects. The former always attracts, the latter always repels. So, as God is love, no doctrine in which His goodness is not incorporated can have any connection with the gospel message, for that is all glad tidings, good news. Love is an affection of the mind, excited by worth of any kind, or by those qualities of an object which communicate pleasure. Thus love to God is awakened by just views of His attributes, or recognition of the excellencies of His character. He, by revelation, brings these within the scope of our comprehension, and teaches us to know ourselves, that, finding our need of redemption, we may no longer trust in ourselves, but lay hold on the hope which He has set before us in the gospel.

Hence, effectual and successful preaching consists in showing men, from the inspired word, what they are, what their nature, whither inevitably tending, and the means of escape. Informed in these particulars, and their false hopes dissipated, they will bow to the will of God, gladly accept the offer extended in illimitable love, fly to him who hath become the "author of eternal salvation" to all that believe, and at his hand drink of the sweet waters of life which flow from the boundless ocean of infinite mercy. If the truths of the gospel are preached, they will carry with them conviction of the excellencies of Divine attributes, and excite in the mind of hearers a love toward God strong enough to draw them to the throne of grace. He who repents simply or mainly through fear of suffering, is ready to recant whenever that fear is removed or quieted, and to withdraw the little love to

God which some noble considerations may have kindled within him.

Since the doctrine of everlasting torture, or, to state it more mildly, of eternal unhappiness, has proved a wretched failure, it is shallow to talk about the destruction of the wicked being a dangerous doctrine, and any attempt to show it so by childlike assumptions is too frivolous and unreasonable for notice, and must be regarded by all well balanced minds as shere folly.

Being so terrible, the torment theory has overreached its mark. Prof. Hudson has well said: "That which is too fearful, is unfeared. Very few, if any, really apprehend that they may live in anguish forever. Hence there is, if all are immortal, a natural hope of final mercy and salvation; which renders the doctrine supposed to be so fearful and safe, a dead letter and an opiate." As we have before intimated, the mind cannot apprehend the idea of endless torture sufficiently to believe it. Dr. Dwight, Congregationalist, says:

"There are, I know, persons who speak concerning future punishment with an air of cool self-complacency, as being, in their view, easy of investigation and free from embarrassment. I am inclined, perhaps uncharitably, to give them little credit for candor, clearness of intellect, or soundness of character; and greatly doubt whether it has been investigated by them."

Bishop Newton remarks:

"Nothing can be more contrary to the divine nature and attributes than for a God all-wise, all-powerful, all-good, all-perfect, to bestow existence on any beings

whose destiny he foresees and foreknows must terminate in wretchedness and misery, without recovery or remedy, without respite or end. . . . God is love; and he would rather have not given life, than render that life a torment and a curse to all eternity. Imagine creatures delivered over to the torments of endless ages without the least hope or possibility of redemption. *Imagine* it you may, but you can *never seriously believe* it, nor *reconcile it with God and goodness.*"—*Dissertation on "Final Condition of Man." London edition,* 1787.

Dr. Edward Beecher has truly said of the orthodox theory of punishment:

"It involves God, his whole administration, and his eternal kingdom, in the deepest dishonor that the mind of man or angel can conceive. The human mind cannot be held back from abhorring such a theory, except by the most unnatural violence to its divinely-inspired convictions of right and honor."—*Conflict of Ages.*

And where is to be found relief from this gloomy theory? We have clearly shown that revelation affords it. "The soul that sinneth it shall *die*" "All the wicked will" God "*destroy.*" A writer has aptly said: "The destruction of the wicked is not an impossible process, or offensive to our ideas of equity. Is it not infinitely preferable, if we decide by our moral instincts, that the wicked should expire all their miserable breath into the night, when the sunset of hope arrives, than that they should be kept in bitter and everlasting woe aud sin?" "The wages of sin is *death*," a death which, as says Dr. Whedon, *knows no resurrection.*

That the extinction of the wicked is a "dangerous

doctrine" is a strange cry for those to set up who have "permitted" the "doctrine of future retribution" to "fall out of notice; so much so that a Universalist might be a constant hearer in almost any of our," so called, orthodox "churches, and seldom hear his notions interfered with from the pulpit." We are reminded by it of the policy pursued by the Scribes and Pharisees whom Jesus denounced, saying to them, "Ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in." Having learned that it is at war with Scripture teaching, they do not preach their own doctrine concerning the destiny of the wicked, thus virtually acknowledging it to be false; and yet they *denounce* those who *do* preach and *insist* on preaching a doctrine of retribution that is not only in perfect harmony with the revealed attributes of God, but also plainly taught in the Bible. A truly unenviable position is theirs.

The gospel message is love; and the religion of the Bible is love. But one characteristic of this religion of fear is that it supplants the religion of love. Evidence of this is afforded by the remark, similar to what we have already quoted, not unfrequently made by Christian people, "If I believed extinction of being to be the sinner's punishment, I would take my ease, and make the most of this life." It is most likely true that these misrepresent themselves. If they do not, then their religion is utterly devoid of love. Our blessed Master, "for the *joy* set before him, endured the cross" and despised "the shame." This, not fear of torture, should be the incentive to faithfulness with all followers of Jesus. Infinite love has revealed life

and unspeakable joy in store for the righteous. Learning this, men love the Almighty Giver, and, enduring cross, despising shame, they "press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling."

All true Christians *love* God, and that because He first loved them; not because they fear the infliction of suffering. God is love; and every faithful disciple of Jesus will yet rejoice in a time when the voice of wailing and sorrow will never more be heard, but from everywhere will go up ascriptions of glory, honor, praise to God and to the Lamb forever and ever. Amen.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE DOCTRINE OF INHERENT IMMORTALITY.

THE doctrine of the immortality of the soul, that man possesses in himself the principle of eternal life, became so thoroughly seated in the Christian mind as to be generally esteemed a self-evident matter; and hence any attempt to demonstrate the soundness of the proposition was looked upon by most people as an absolutely needless effort. So as very few even of those who judged the subject a proper one for investigation, had the boldness to try the doctrine by the only true standard of appeal, and then announce the result and stand by it, a pretty general ignorance was preserved, people continuing, by reason of hearing it from earliest infancy, to grow up into the belief that they knew they were immortal because, first: the Bible is full of the doctrine; second: they could feel it.

Almost universally, comparatively speaking, though this idea came to be entertained, there have always been those who, justly esteeming the word of God the only source of light and knowledge respecting a future life. have believed, and contended for the truth that man is by nature wholly mortal, and can only have a future life upon certain divinely-announced conditions; but such ones have usually been regarded as subjects of delusion. During the past few years, however, a change has come over the spirit of this great human dream. In the wise order of Omnipotence the time seems to have come when the dogma of inherent immortality, which came in as a corrupter of the faith of the Church, should be cast out, and the Church cleansed of the idolatry—such it may be called — into which it has fallen.

Throughout that awful dark night of apostacy, lasting several centuries, when the so-called Christian Church seems, as such, to have held in its purity scarcely any part of the faith once delivered unto the saints, there were, as we have remarked, a few who clung to the truth concerning man's hope of a future life, but the number has greatly augmented since the rolling tide of reformation fairly set in, and now it has many, many thousands of faithful adherents throughout the various religious organizations, both in this country and in Europe.

We have shown that those Scripture texts that are relied on by many to prove the doctrine of divine origin do not teach it: now let us see what some of those called orthodox say concerning the question as to whether it is taught in the Bible. Bishop Watson says:

"I have read volumes on the nature of the soul, but I have no scruple in saying I know nothing about it. Hoping as I do for eternal life through Jesus Christ, I am not disturbed at my inability to clearly convince myself that the soul is or is not a substance distinct from the body."

This learned and eminent man desires to *know* something about what is termed the immortal soul, and having searched the Scriptures thoroughly, having read volumes of treatises on the question, and having thought deeply on the subject, calling to his aid all his rich store of knowledge, frankly admits at last that he knows "*nothing about it;*" that he is unable to convince himself that the soul *is or is not* a substance distinct from the body. Can it be reasonably supposed that if the Bible taught the natural immortality of a part of man, the essential part, which exists in a state of consciousness while the other part is dead, that Bishop Watson, thirsting as he did for that very knowledge and yearning to possess it, should utterly fail of obtaining it? To assert it is to virtually charge him, eminent and learned as he was, with such a lack of discrimination, such an inability to comprehend plain propositions (for if the doctrine is taught in the Bible at all, it surely must be plainly taught) as would rank him below ordinary minds. Though we have before quoted that other Watson, the great Methodist, we do so now, what he says on this point being again in place. He remarks:

"Some suppose consciousness is an essential attribute of Spirit; and the soul is naturally immortal; the former of which cannot be proved, while the latter is

contradicted by the Bible, which makes our immortality a *gift dependent* on the will of the giver."—*Institutes, vol. ii.*

In another part of the same volume he calls the "natural immortality of the soul," "an absurdity." Be it observed that, having closed his investigations of the subject, he does not choose to say he knows nothing about it, but he goes further and says the doctrine is "contradicted by the Bible." Archbishop Whately says:

"To the Christian, indeed, all this doubt would be instantly removed, if he found that the immortality of the soul, as a disembodied spirit, were revealed in the word of God. . . . In fact, however, no such doctrine is revealed to us."

Strong language that, but no stronger than facts justify the use of. Others are equally emphatic on the point. Listen to Olshausen. He says:

"The Bible knows not either the expression immortality of the soul, or the modern doctrine of immortality. . . . The *doctrine* of the immortality of the soul and the *name* are alike unknown in the entire Bible."

Dr. Proudfit remarks: "That best and brightest of revelations . . . announces not an immortal *soul*, but an immortal *man*." Bishop Tillotson rather reluctantly, seemingly, admits that "the immortality of the soul is rather supposed, or taken for granted, than expressly revealed in the Bible." Just think of it, dear reader! The Bible gives a minute account of the creation of what theologists are pleased to call the "tenement of clay," the house which the *real man* inhabits but says nothing about *the man* himself, and, aside from *rather supposing* his existence, ignores him alto-

gether. Is not such a position most palpably unreasonable? Nay, is it not more than that? And yet there are at the present time hundreds, perhaps thousands, of ministers preaching the doctrine of inherent immortality, men who are considered reliable teachers of theology, who are compelled to acknowledge that the Bible *does not teach* the immortality of the soul; but say they, it *assumes* it. This is worse than blind leading the blind: it may be termed a wilful effort to keep people in ignorance of gospel truth. May our kind and loving Father forgive it.

We might quote from other eminent orthodoxists who acknowledge that the Bible does not teach man's immortality, but we forbear, adding only our own testimony. We solemnly assert that inherent immortality is not a Scripture doctrine. Since, then, it is not of the Bible, when and how did it become

A DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH?

In the year 1513 a Council was held under Pope Leo X., and during its session the following decree was passed:

"Whereas, some have dared to assert concerning the nature of the reasonable soul, that it is mortal; we, with the approbation of the sacred council, *do condemn* and reprobate all those who assert that the intellectual soul is mortal, seeing that the soul is not only truly, and of itself, and essentially the form of the human body, as is expressed in the canon of Pope Clement the Fifth, but likewise *immortal;* and *we strictly inhibit* all from dogmatizing otherwise, and we decree that all who adhere to the like erroneous assertions shall be *shunned and punished as heretics.*"

From this decree we learn three important facts—first: the immortality of the soul did not become a *church doctrine* until 1513, during the pontificate of Leo X.; second: that at that time the opposition was so strong it was found necessary, in order to overcome it, to decree that all who denied the doctrine should be "punished as heretics," a custom still preserved to some extent; third: that it was only two centuries earlier, during the reign of Clement V., that a soul-entity was recognized as a part of the church faith. What then becomes of the modern claim that it was always a doctrine of the Church, a part of the Church faith? It seems the Church had not so early as the pontificate of Clement V., got so far along as to be ready to affirm *immortality* of the soul, the canon of that pontiff only asserting the existence of a soul-entity, and that it is "truly, and of itself, and essentially the form of the human body." Concerning the decree of 1513, Luther wrote thus:

"I permit the Pope to make articles of faith for himself and his faithful—such as the soul is the substantial 'form of the human body,' that the soul is immortal, with all those monstrous opinions found in the Roman dung-hill of decretals."

Surely no discreet person will read this language of the great reformer and then say that Martin Luther believed in the immortality of the soul, a doctrine which the great body of professing Christians of the present time are so jealous of as to make belief in it essential to church fellowship. The question may be asked, Why, if Luther did not believe the doctrine, do we not find more against it in his writings? Simply

because, doubtless, there existed, in his estimation, more glaring evils to combat. But however this may be, it is positively certain he would not, if he believed the doctrine, denounce it as one of the *monstrous opinions found in the Roman dunghill of decretals.* To one who attacked the doctrines of Martin Luther, William Tyndale, the martyr, replied as follows:

"In putting departed souls in heaven, hell, and purgatory, you destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove the resurrection. What God doth with them, that shall we know when we come to them. The *true faith* putteth the *resurrection,* which we be warned to look for every hour. The heathen philosophers, denying that, did put that souls did ever live. And the Pope joineth the spiritual doctrine of Christ and the fleshly doctrine of the philosophers together—things so contrary that they cannot agree. . . . And because the fleshly-minded Pope consenteth unto heathen doctrine, therefore he corrupteth the Scriptures to establish it. . . . If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good case as the angels be? And then what cause is there of the resurrection?"

These questions neither pope nor priest could answer; nor has any body ever been able to answer them. That they are *unanswerable,* is amply attested by the wide-spread belief among professing Christians that there will be no resurrection whatever, a belief which has been inspired in the Church by and *only* by the doctrine of inherent immotality. The Pope, says Tyndale, "joineth the spiritual doctrine of Christ" (resurrection from the dead for such as comply with gospel conditions) "and the fleshly doctrine" (inherent immortality, and conciousness in death) of the

"heathen philosophers together — things so contrary that they cannot agree." "The fleshly-minded Pope," he affirms, "consenteth unto heathen doctrine" (the immortality of the soul) "and therefore he *corrupteth the Scriptures* to establish it." How did Pope Leo X. corrupt the Scriptures to establish the doctrine of the immortality of the soul? By getting the Council to declare it to be true, a Bible doctrine; *strictly inhibiting* all from dogmatizing otherwise, and decreeing that all who denied it should be *shunned* and *punished as heretics.* Such arguments are apt to carry conviction. How preposterous in us to deny the doctrine, since a *Papal Council* has made it a tenet of the Bible and Church!

But who and what was this man who procured the issue of a decree declaring this new church doctrine, belief in which is now, as then, assumed to be so necessary as to be made a test of church fellowship? We quote from J. Panton Ham, who says:

"The pontificate of Leo was an epoch in the history of the doctrine of the soul's immortality. It was then that the successful effort was made to establish and give permanence to this doctrine; but it was made by a usurper of the right of private judgment, and accomplished by an act of sarcedotal despotism. The advocates of the doctrine of the soul's immortality need to be reminded of this suspicious passage in its historic progress. The seal of authority was annexed to it by a Roman Pontiff, in the dawn of the sixteenth century, a man, the worthy counterpart of England's Charles II., fond of fashion and field-sports, and mixing up in all the dissipated excesses of the sacred metropolis. Such was his extravagance, that the 'charge has been

laid at his door,' says Ranke, 'that he ran through the wealth of three Pontificates—that of his predecessors, from whom he inherited considerable treasure; his own, and that of his successor, to whom he bequeathed a mass of debt.' . . . 'At court,' proceeds Ranke, 'they spoke of the institutions of the Catholic church, and of passages in the Holy Scriptures, only in a tone of jesting; the mysteries of faith were held in derision.'

"Such was Pope Leo the Tenth, and such the circle of sanctified society of which he was the animating centre! Behold, ye asserters of your own inherent immortality, the worthy 'nursing father' of your faith! the hero of a hey-day heterodoxy! the jolly jester with the solemn sanctities of Scripture! the mocker of the sacred mysteries!

"Worthy patron of a Pagan progeny! Let it be registered as the genuine genealogy of a fundamental doctrine of modern British Christendom, that the Pagan Plato was its father, and the profligate Pope Leo its foster father. Born and bred by the Pagan philosphy, and the *protege* of Popery, this notion of the soul's immortality has become a pet dogma of Popular Protestantism, which with a strange forgetfulness of its low lineage, openly declares it to be the honorable offspring of true orthodoxy."

Yes, such was the man who corrupted the Scriptures to establish a heathen doctrine. Well indeed might advocates of the soul's immortality consider "this suspicious passage in its historic progress." The theory seems to have been introduced into the Church in the second century, and in the third it had begun to gain many supporters. Circumstances justify the conclusion that just in proportion as the faith of the Church became corrupted and its vital godliness lost, did the belief spread until the reign of Clement V

(1305), when, for reasons which will presently appear, the existence of a soul-entity was declared (not yet its immortality; the church, corrupt as it had become, was not yet ready for that). Although inherent immortality was then very widely believed, it was evidently deemed unnecessary, perhaps unsafe to attempt to make a canon of any thing more than the *existence* of a *soul-entity*.

So early as the 9th century the synodal courts authorized or consented that the ecclesiastical penance should be discharged by the payment of alms, of which the Church was to be the dispenser. At the time of the crusades, taking the cross was particularly recommended as a substitute for the ecclesiastical penalties, and at the assembly of Clermont (1095), Urban II. granted a plenary indulgence to those who should join the crusade. Thus seems to have been instituted what became the doctrine of indulgences, but it was not until much later that it became a system. In the 13th century it was systematically developed by Alexander of Hales and Thomas Aquinas.

The doctrine, as thus systematized, was, briefly stated, that all the good works of the saints over and above what was required for the satisfaction of their own sins, are, together with the infinite merits of Christ, deposited, so to speak, in one grand receptacle or treasury, the keys of which are committed to the Pope. In granting an indulgence, a portion of this superabundant merit is transferred to particular persons by the Pope, and is used by them in satisfaction of divine justice.

These indulgences were only to be had for a consid-

eration, generally the payment of money, not unfrequently of large amounts; and an immense income to the Church was thereby secured. Of course it thus became an object with the Church to increase this revenue, and as comparatively few, perhaps none, desired indulgences, who did not believe in consciousness and suffering in death, it was found necessary to do something to establish that belief more generally. Hence, we are forced to conclude, the soul-entity canon of Clement V.; hence also the declaration of the immortality of that entity, and *inhibition* of all denial of it under penalty of punishment as heretics, by the Council under Leo X.

If any are disposed to question this let them first give due consideration to the fact that about the time of Clement V., the traffic in indulgences *marvellously increased.* It was Clement VI. who, a few years later, decreed that the festival of the year of jubilee, an occasion when a vast business in indulgences was transacted, should be held every 50th instead of every 100th year. The interval was afterward reduced by Urban VI. (1389) to 33, and still later by Paul II. (1470) to 25 years. It is said that during one of these years as many as two hundred thousand pilgrims were counted in Rome in a single month. All these brought rich offerings, and the treasury was rapidly filled.

As to Leo X., it was his abandoned use of the indulgence system which did very much toward precipitating the great reformation movement. Under his Pontificate indulgences were sold for sins to be committed. Illustrative of the excess to which matters were carried, is the following circumstance in the experience

of Tetzel, the infamous tool of Leo. A Saxon, having bargained for thirty crowns, for permission to commit an act of violence, took out the worth of his money upon Tetzel himself. He way-laid that functionary, and, having beaten him grievously, carried off the chest which contained the very money he had paid. He was brought to trial, but upon exhibiting his "indulgence," he was acquitted. Speaking of the condition of the Romish church at about this time, a historian says:

"Rome inwardly laughed at christendom around her, while she showed her spell to be of such a nature, that to break it, needed another might than that of emperors, kings, bishops, and doctors, with all the science and all the power of the age and the Church. . . . The philosophers of Alexandria had spoken of a fire wherein men ought to be purified; and now Rome set forth this as a doctrine of the Church: adding, that indulgences could deliver souls from this intermediate state, in which otherwise their sins would detain them. Nothing was omitted that could inspire fire. Man is prompted by his own nature to dread an unknown future; and this dread was worked upon and augmented. Who, then, could withold the price of a ransom? So the revolting trade went on, Pope after Pope finding new methods of increasing it. . . . Thus the clergy had disgraced both religion and themselves. Well might Luther exclaim, 'The ecclesiastical state is opposed to God and his glory. . . . Every man feels disgust when he hears of an ecclesiastic. The evil had spread through all ranks: corruption of manners kept pace with corruption of faith, and a mystery of iniquity lay like an incubus on the enslaved Church of Christ. The vital doctrines of the Scriptures had nearly disappeared. The strength of the Church had

been wasted: and its body lay stretched upon that part of the earth which the Roman empire had occupied, enfeebled, exhausted, and all but lifeless."—*D'Aubigne's Reformation.*

Such is the testimony of an eminent scholar, historian, and Protestant theologian. So at last we have it all. Summed up in few words it stands thus: *No immortal soul doctrine*, no purgatory nor hell torments; and hence no income from the sale of indulgences; no enormous revenue from the pretence of praying souls out of the fire; no "Peter's pence," no nothing but financial poverty and leanness. What a withering rebuke is all this to them who arrogantly denounce as little, if any, better than infidels, all such as deny the inherent immortality and torment doctrine. The same objections that are now urged against the doctrine of man's mortality, and unconsciousness in death, were then advanced. More asked:

"What shall he care how long he live in sin, that believeth Luther, that he shall after this life feel neither good nor evil in body nor soul, until the day of doom?"

To this Tyndale replied:

"Christ and his apostles taught no other, but warned to look for Christ's *coming again* every hour; which coming again, *because ye believe will never be, therefore have ye feigned that other merchandize.*"

As was it in the 16th century, so now most of those religionists who hold to man's immortality, virtually deny the second coming of Christ, a very large and, we fear, rapidly increasing class denying it absolutely. Denying those plainest of all Scripture truths, the

return of Christ and his reign on the earth, they feign "that other merchandize, inherent immortality and consciousness in death. As showing the tendency of belief in this popular doctrine to lead to denial of plain Scripture truth; and also as evidencing that we are justified in affirming it is not a Bible but a heathen doctrine, we quote the following from an orthodox writer:

"We would express our conviction that the idea of the immortality of the soul has no source in the Gospel; that it comes, on the contrary, from the Platonists, and that it was just when the coming of Christ was *denied* in the church, or at least began to be lost sight of, that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul came in to *replace that of the resurrection*. . . . It is hardly needful to say that we do not doubt the immortality of the soul; we only assert that this doctrine has taken the place of the doctrine of the church, as the epoch of its joy and glory."

Who is not made sad at seeing such words from the pen of a Christian writer? Without *daring* to deny that the resurrection is a Bible doctrine, it is in one sentence admitted that the immortality of the soul is a Platonic doctrine, and in another it is asserted that that heathen idea "has taken the place of the doctrine (resurrection) of the church, as the *epoch of its joy and glory*." Let them appreciate such language who can: and let them appreciate such sentiments who are very ignorant concerning gospel truth; for such only *can* do so.

Nothing more need be said on this point, so manifest is it how and why the immortality of the soul became

a Church doctrine. Having seen that Pope Leo X. was its foster father; and that it came as a Platonic theory into the Church in the second century, we will now examine more fully concerning its source, viz.:

HEATHEN PHILOSOPHY.

That the Egyptians were the first who taught the immortality of the soul, most historical writers and scholars who have given particular attention to the subject are agreed. An eminent scholar of our time, and a believer in the doctrine, says: "The Egyptians were the people of the earliest historical civilization, and they were the first to affirm the immortality of the soul." Howitt, the historian, speaking of the dispersion at the time of the building of the tower of Babel, remarks:

"But before they were thus scattered they corrupted the religious doctrines they received from their great progenitor, Noah; or rather had them set aside in order to *deify* Noah and his three sons, whom they had come to regard as a reappearance of Adam, Cain, Abel, and Seth. The singular coincidence of circumstances between Adam and Noah forced this upon their imagination. Adam the first man and father of the first world, and Noah the first man and father of the second world, had each three sons conspicuous in history; and of these three, one in each case was a bad one: Cain and Ham. Led by this to consider the second family but an avatar" (descent of a deity in a visible form or incarnation) "of the first family, they regarded them as *immortal* and worshipped them. From hence we have in all Pagan mythologies a *triad* of principal God's; one of whom is in each case, in a deity of a dark nature, like *Cain and Ham.*"

Herodotus, a very ancient historian, says of the Egyptians:

"They are the *first of mankind* who have defended the immortality of the soul. They believe that on the dissolution of the body, the soul immediately enters some other animal, and that after using as vehicles every species of terrestrial, aquatic, and winged creatures, it finally enters a second time a human body. They affirm that it undergoes all these changes in the space of three thousand years. This opinion some among the Greeks have adopted as their own."

Bunsen says:

"The Egyptians were the first who taught the doctrine of the immortality of the soul—a fact mentioned by all Greek writers from Herodotus to Aristotle."

As no Old Testament writer or prophet makes any mention of or intimates belief in the doctrine of inherent immortality, the question presents itself, "How came it to pass that the heathen knew of it before God's chosen people, they to whom He revealed himself? This is a question not easily answered upon the assumption that the doctrine is of divine origin. Will any reasonable person undertake to say there is any probability whatever that God enlightened the Egyptians concerning this important matter (if true it is very important) and left the children of Israel in darkness? None would be so thoughtless or unreasonable as to assert it.

It is claimed by many theorists, theologists in particular, that the doctrine was held in a "base form" by the Egyptians. That the Egyptians, or heathen gen-

erally held it in a base form is certainly a bold assumption, and, we think, an unwarranted one, for it may properly be considered a real question whether the doctrine of inherent immortality as now held is not more base and inconsistent than as held by many heathen. While the arguments that are now offered in proof of the existence of deathless entities in human beings prove equally the existence of such entities in brute animals, the doctrine as now held denies immortality to them, whereas heathen philosophy accorded it. Richard Watson, having claimed that "the presence of an immaterial soul with the body is the source of animal life," says:

"It is granted that, on the premises laid down, not only must an immaterial principle be allowed to man, but to all animals possessed of volition; and few, perhaps none, are found *without this property*. . . . It does not however follow that they are *immortal*, because they are *immaterial*. The truth is, that God only hath independent immortality, because He only is self-existent, and neither human nor brute souls are of necessity immortal."—*Institute, Part* 2.

Bishop Warburton says:

"I think it may be strictly demonstrated that man has an immaterial soul; but then the same arguments which prove *that*, prove likewise that the souls of all living animals are immortal."

Not a few other deep thinkers have arrived at conclusions in this matter similar to those of Watson and Warburton. Isaac Taylor says:

"As to the pretended demonstrations of immortality drawn from the assumed simplicity and indestructibility of the soul as an immaterial substance, they

appear altogether inconclusive, or if conclusive, then such as must be admitted to apply with scarcely diminished force to all sentient orders; and it must be granted that *whatever has felt*, and has *acted spontaneously*, must live *again and forever*."

And why should not the same arguments which are supposed to prove that man has an immaterial entity within him, prove that inferior animals are also thus endowed? Does the presence of animal life afford proof? They have it. Does consciousness? They possess it. Does mind? That phenomena is exhibited in them. Does reason? They are endowed with that faculty. Is this denied? Surely not by any one who has taken any interest in the subject. Notwithstanding the wolf's keen appetite for flesh, it is only after serving a long apprenticeship that he becomes a good hunter. Young swallows, who have never effected a migration, are trained by repeated evolutions performed in troops. After they have become sufficiently experienced in their trial trips, the whole army takes its flight under the guidance of experienced leaders. The bird of prey *teaches* its young ones to launch out into the air, to hover, and to measure the distance at which a victim is to be struck. James Hogg, better known as the Ettrick Shepherd, a Scottish writer, has said of one of his dogs:

"He had never turned sheep in his life; but as soon as he discovered that it was his duty to do so, and that it obliged me, I can never forget with what anxiety and eagerness he learned his different evolutions; he would try every way, deliberately, till he found out what I wanted him to do; and when once I made him *understand* a direction, he never mistook or forgot it.

Well as I knew him, he often astonished me, for when hard pressed, in accomplishing the task which was set him, he had expedients of the moment, that bespoke a great share of the *reasoning faculty*."

Evidences of the exercise of reasoning faculties, by brute animals, are so numerous it seems almost a waste of time to note any particular ones. John Locke says: "Birds learning of tunes, and the endeavors some may observe in them to hit the notes right, put it past doubt with me that they have *perception*, and retain *ideas* in their *memories* and *use them for patterns*."

"The possession of this kind of intelligence and reasoning power, is not confined to the human species. We have already seen that there are many instinctive actions in man as well as in animals. It is no less true that, in the higher animals, there is often the same *exercise of reasoning power* as in man. The degree of this power is much less in them than in him, but its *nature is the same*. Whenever, in an animal, we see any action performed, with the evident intention of accomplishing a particular object, such an action is plainly the result of reasoning power, not essentially different from our own. . . .

"The teachibility of many animals, and their capacity of forming new habits, or improving the old ones, are instances of the same kind of intellectual power, and are quite different from instinct, strictly speaking. It is this faculty which especially predominates over the other in the higher classes of animals, and which finally attains its maximum of development in the human species." — *Dalton, in Treatise on Human Physiology.*

None, we think, will deny that lower animals are

possessed of reasoning faculties. The *quality* of mind, or larger reasoning capacity cannot be justly regarded as evidencing the existence of an immaterial entity in man, and not in other animals, for some of the lower types of the human species rank quite as low, if not lower in the scale of intelligence than some of the higher types of the brute. As, then, the Egyptians, like many other heathen, did hold that the lower animals are possessed of a soul-entity, Warburton, Watson, and others must be considered as testifying that the doctrine as held by the heathen was more consistent in some respects, at least, than as now held. Since belief in the immortality of the soul is held by so many to be an essential item of faith, we should, if any weight is to attach to the claim, expect to find the Egyptians, the originators of the doctrine, giving evidence of its power. We certainly shall not just here deny that they did afford such evidence abundantly, and if so then the general character of that people will determine somewhat the tendency of belief in the doctrine. Let us see what was their character. Tytler, the historian, speaking of Egyptian superstition, says:

"The same animals that were regarded, in one province, with the most superstitious reverence, were, in another, the objects of detestation and abhorrence. In one quarter they tamed the crocodiles, adorned them with gold and jewels, and worshipped them; in another they killed those animals without mercy. In one province the most sacred animal was a dog; in another they reckoned dog's flesh as the most delicate food. Cats were adorned in one district, and rats in another. From these differences arose perpetual and violent animosities; for there are no contentions so

rancorous as those which spring from the most trifling differences in religious worship or opinion. 'The multitude,' says Diodorus, 'have been often inflamed into the highest pitch of fury, on account of the sacrilegious murder of a *divine cat*.'

"The extravagant length to which the Egyptians carried their veneration for their consecrated animals exceeds all belief. The sacred crocodile, the dog, or the cat were kept in an inclosed space set apart adjoining to the temples dedicated to their worship. They were constantly attended by men of the highest rank, whose business was to provide them with the choicest victuals, which they were at pains to dress in the manner they supposed most agreeable to their palate. They washed them in warm baths, and anointed them with the richest perfumes. The finest carpets were spread for them to lie on; chains of gold and circlets of precious stones were hung around their legs and necks; and when the stupid animal, insensible of the honors that were bestowed on him, died, like the rest of his kind, the whole province was filled with lamentation; and not only the fortunes of the priests, but the public revenue was without scruple expended in the performance of the most sumptuous funeral obsequies.

"It is not then to be wondered at that the superstitions of the Egyptians were a copious subject of ridicule to other nations of antiquity, and contributed to degrade them in the opinion of those whose objects of religious worship, if not fundamentally more rational, were less ludicrous, less childish and unmanly. What could they think of a nation where, as Herodotus tells us, if a house was on fire, the father of a family would take more pains to save his cats than his wife and children? where a mother would be transported with joy at the news of her child being devoured by a crocodile; or where the soldiers, returning from

a military expedition, would come home loaded with a precious booty of dogs, cats, hawks, and vultures?

"The general character of the Egyptians, with respect to morals, contributed likewise to draw upon them the disesteem of other nations. They have been generally accused by the ancients of great cunning and insincerity in their dealings."

Such were they who originated the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Who will longer claim that belief in it tends to restrain men from the commission of evil, or incite them to acts of goodness? It has been asserted that the Egyptians "seemed to think that the chief end of man was to be buried well, and with them masonry and embalment were the chief arts in request." That this is true is, we think, generally conceded. And what does it show? Why, that notwithstanding their speculations about their real life inhering in something *within* them, they considered the outward, the visible self the most worthy object of attention. It strongly indicates, too, that they did not fully believe what they professed, an example followed by many of their heathen disciples of other nations, and by not a few in the present day respecting certain views attendant upon belief of the doctrine of man's immortality. It may not be a pleasant reflection for some, nor flattering to their pride, but it is well for all to remember that the idea of inherent immortality was not revealed to the Hebrews, but was conceived by a people who worshipped cats, dogs, crocodiles, etc.; a people whose general character, with respect to morals, drew "upon them the disesteem of other nations."

Of the Greeks, Pythagoras stands prominent as a teacher of the doctrine. He became a Roman citizen. He flourished about 520 B. C. Like the Egyptians, he particularly taught the *transmigration of souls*. He it was of whom Xenophanes, his contemporary, relates that, "seeing a dog beaten, and hearing him howl, begged the striker to desist, adding, 'It is the soul of a friend of mine, whom I recognize by his voice.'" Could the deceased friend have heard the remark, he would most likely have regarded such a reference to his voice as any thing but complimentary. That human souls should inhabit dogs, and instead of uttering words of wisdom, become howling brutes, may be thought very base, as it surely is, but it is not so base as that souls should inhabit tables, writing-desks, and other senseless things: nor is the howling of a dog much more unlike the sweetest sounds of the human voice than is very much of the trash which reaches the world through the medium of tables unlike the living utterances of those to whom it is attributed.

Next comes Socrates, who lived something less than a century later than Pythagoras. He did not teach transmigration, but he taught some things equally absurd. It is recorded in history that—

"This philosopher believed in the Divine origin of dreams and omens, and was a supporter of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul."

Socrates wrote no books, but Plato wrote his life. Plato was the pupil of Socrates, and became thoroughly imbued with his philosophy. After the death of Socrates Plato traveled considerably, remaining, in one of his journeys, some time in the Greek cities of

lower Italy, the home of Pythagoreanism. Here he seems to have so far departed from the philosophy of Socrates as to adopt the Pythagorean doctrine of transmigration, which he afterward taught. History informs us that his "general mode of philosophizing was in antiquity regarded as strongly Pythagorean." Then came Cicero, an able defender of inherent immortality He was less popular than Plato.

Plato's writings were favorites alike with Pagan and Christian antiquity; and thus it came about that his teachings corrupted the Christian church, as they had already corrupted the Hebrew; for the Pharisaic belief was truly Pythagorean. True, Paul is appealed to for proof that the Pharisees believed in a resurrection; but it is clear that their idea of a resurrection was simply transmigration: and even this peculiar sort of resurrection they denied to the notoriously wicked. In Acts xxiii. 8, we read—"For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both." Concerning this Prideaux remarks:

"The Pharisees confess both: that is, first: there is to be resurrection from the dead; and second: that there are angels and spirits. But according to Josephus this resurrection of theirs was no more than a Pythagorean resurrection; that is, a resurrection of the soul only by transmigration into another body, and being born anew with it. But from this resurrection they excluded all that were notoriously wicked. . . . But as to lesser crimes, their opinion was that they were punished in the bodies which the souls of those that committed them were next sent into."

The question put to Jesus by the disciples, "Who

did sin, this man or his parents that he was born blind?" shows conclusively that they were not only familiar with the doctrine of transmigration but, until better taught, believed it. Nothing but an assumption of transmigration of souls could suggest the query whether the man himself had sinned, that he should be *born* blind, for if being *born* blind was because of *his own* sin, the sin must of course have been committed while he pre-existed in another body.

In the early days of Christianity the church was much perplexed by certain Platonic philosophers, known as "New Platonic," who, professing to accept the Christian religion insisted upon being recognized as Christians. In the second century they succeeded in this. It seems to have been thought that as they were learned and respected it was best to recognize them. From this time the Platonic theory of inherent immortality, slightly modified, began to spread in the church, and continued gradually to do so until certain ecclesiastical dignitaries conceived the idea, as we have already shown, of turning it to financial account, which idea they utilized by making denial of the doctrine punishable as heresy, thus seeking to *compel* belief in it.

It is a common remark that "belief in the immortality of the soul is and has been almost universal." We have clearly shown that this is not now, and has not been the case in the Christian church; and we will also show that it is not true of the heathen. Prof. Leland, in his work on "The Advantages and Necessity of the Christian Revelation," says:

"What that great man, Cicero, says of the philosophers of his time is remarkable. In that celebrated treatise where he sets himself to prove the immortality of the soul, he represents the *contrary* as the *prevailing* opinion; that there were crowds of opponents, not the epicureans only, but, which he could not account for, those that were the most learned, had that doctrine in contempt."

Prof. Stewart says:

"Cicero, incomparably the most able defender of the soul's immortality the heathen world can yet boast, very ingenuously confesses, that after all the arguments which he had adduced in order to confirm the doctrine in question, it so fell out, that his mind was satisfied of it only when directly employed in contemplating the arguments adduced in its favor. At *all other times* he fell unconsciously into a state of *doubt and darkness*."

This admission by Cicero affords a complete refutation of the claim, often made by believers of the doctrine, that people *know* they are immortal because they are conscious of it, etc. If there were any truth in such arguments then all would experience the same feeling, which is not the case. Prof. Hudson (*Debt and Grace*) quotes from Socrates as follows:

"Can the soul, which goes to the presence of a good and wise God (whither my soul shall shortly go), can this soul of ours, when separated from the body, be immediately dispersed and destroyed, as *most men assert?*"

It is known that some of the early fathers held to the existence of a soul-entity in man, but they believed it to be mortal, and that the securing of its immortality depended upon conditions.

If men will persist in teaching the doctrine of in-

herent immortality, why, let them do it; but since the origin of the theory is so obvious, we protest, in the name of both reason and revelation, against their palming it off upon the unsuspecting as a Bible doctrine. It has "*no source in the* gospel," but "comes, on the contrary, from the Platonists," and "it was *just when the coming of Christ was denied* in the Church, or at least began to be lost sight of, that" it "came in to *replace that of the resurrection.*"

CHAPTER XVII.

SCRIPTURE MOTIVE TO OBEDIENCE AND FAITHFULNESS.

For reasons too obvious to require statement, it has become a custom, extensively practiced among preachers and exhorters holding to the popular faith respecting man's nature, to urge meditations on death, etc., as a motive to repentance on the part of unbelievers, and to constancy on the part of believers. With reference to the basis upon which this motive is made to rest, viz., the expectation of an entrance, at death, into a state either of blessedness or woe, we have only to say, there is not a single passage of Scripture that, reasonably interpreted, warrants such an expectation.

If those portions of holy writ that testify to the coming of Christ, as the time for the fruition of Christian hopes, were expunged, what promise, or evidence of whatever character, could any believer produce that would furnish a satisfactory reason for his hope? We know of none. The fulfillment of every promise of a future life is made to depend upon the return of our Lord from heaven. If he comes not, there can be no resurrection; and if there be no resurrection, then even "they which have fallen asleep in Christ are perished," and so "shall not see light." While, therefore, religionists generally, believing they have arguments more effective and precious, so far fail of a proper ap-

preciation of that great central truth in the gospel glad tidings which, like its inseparable companion, "God is love," lends vitality and lustre to all others, that, unlike our Lord himself, the apostles, and early church generally, they wholly neglect to urge it upon the consideration of either sinner or believer, let us inquire whether it, instead of death or torment, is not the great scriptural motive to obedience and godliness.

What is set forth in the gospel as the motive to *repentance?* We answer, the second coming of Christ. "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus Christ . . . whom the heavens must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken."—Acts iii. 19, 21. There is no fact connected with all the future, a contemplation of which by sinners is so effective in inducing penitence, as the coming of Christ. The most important secret of its power, if we except an overwhelming evidence of its nearness, in which case multitudes of cowardly drones would be frightened into a species of repentance, lies in its tendency to lead men to see what they are, and consequently what they need; for the first inquiry suggested to the mind when impressed with that truth is, "What is Christ coming to do?" When it is seen that his first work will be the giving of life and immortality to his people, and sealing the doom of eternal death upon unbelievers, the inevitable query of each is, "What relationship do I sustain toward him?" When the mind reaches this point, the indulgence of a hope of final restoration, a sentiment largely prevalent among

both believers and unbelievers, is utterly precluded, and they are left to deal only with stern, inexorable truth. They then realize that life and death are set before them, and that it is theirs to choose.

What is the scriptural motive to *mortification of animal lusts?* We reply, Christ's second coming. "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory. Mortify, therefore, your members which are upon the earth," etc.—Col. iii. 4, 5. All who have learned the truth that they have not immortality in themselves, but must depend upon the coming of Christ to bestow it, are *therefore,* if not grossly inconsistent, especially careful to "mortify" their "members." They sin not against God by unholy gratification of sensual appetites, but keep all under dominion; using them only to the glory of God and to the honor of Christ. They strive to keep the fleshly nature in subjection to the spiritual, and seek things pertaining to the kingdom of God, which Jesus will establish at his coming.

What is the scriptural motive to a practice of general *obedience and holiness?* We reply, the same. "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then shall he reward every man according to his works."—Matt. xvi. 27. "We know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself."—1 John iii. 2, 3. We are not, of course, to understand the apostle as intimating that a man may purify himself without divine assistance. He is speaking of those with whom the coming of Christ is an object of hope.

Such as truly cherish that hope *do* purify themselves by assiduous application, and use all the means which a merciful and loving God has made available. They grow in grace by careful and constant cultivation of that "faith which worketh by love," and purifies the heart. Contemplating the love of God in Christ Jesus, love fills the heart and reaches out and encircles the whole human family, brethren in Christ especially. And to the *exercise* of this love the coming of Christ is the scriptural motive. "And the Lord make you to *increase and abound in love* toward one another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you: to the end he may stablish your hearts unblamable in holiness before God, even the Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."—1 Thess. iii. 12, 13.

The coming of Christ is the scriptural motive to spiritual-mindedness. "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body."—Phil. iii. 20, 21.

The same is the motive to deeds of *kindness* and *mercy*. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory . . . then shall he say unto them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you. . . . I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink . . . naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me . . . inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."—Matt. xxv. 31–40.

It is also the scriptural motive to *moderation* and

sobriety. "Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand."—Phil. iv. 5.

So is it also to *patience* and *long-suffering.* "Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned: behold, the Judge standeth before the door."—James v. 8, 9.

And, finally, the coming of Christ is the scriptural motive to *watchfulness.* "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord. . . . Blessed are those servants whom the Lord, when he cometh, shall find watching."—Luke xii. 35, 37.

It was not the prospect of death, popularly regarded as a mere transition in conscious existence, that the apostles preached as a motive to repentance and obedience. The dogma, incorporated in later theology, of entering a state either of happiness or woe at death, had no place in their teachings, and for the unexceptionable reason that Jesus taught it not to them. On the contrary, they steadfastly asserted, and diligently labored to convince all deniers that man is wholly mortal; that without a union with Christ the LIFE-GIVER; without receiving the spirit which the Father sends in Jesus' name, and yielding obedience to its indications to duty, thus developing a character in harmony with God, they have no germ of eternal life in them, and cannot, therefore, have a deliverance from the power of death. They have not received the spirit of adoption. They are not begotten of the incorruptible seed, and hence cannot have a resurrection birth.

The two great facts in which are centered all the hopes inspired in the minds of a perishing race by the promises of the gospel, are the coming of Christ, and resurrection, or change, if living, of all who are subjects of an indwelling of the "Spirit of him which raised up Jesus from the dead." To no others has a life of happiness been promised; to *none* has a future life of woe been threatened. No others are cheered by the gospel hope, nor made joyful by the accumulating evidence that the time hastens when a kingdom shall be established whose King shall "rule in righteousness."

Those thrilling words of inspiration, "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him;" and, "awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust," are judged dull and incompetent by popular school preachers, in exhorting Christians to faithfulness. They have a way, instituted, as we have seen, by heathen philosophers, more pleasing to the creature. The language of the Saviour, "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day," makes dull music in the ears of those who have a theory which reduces the resurrection to small moment. The testimony of the "sure word of prophecy," "for, behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall

be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch;" they "shall be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power," is regarded by them as rather soothing than otherwise to the ungodly; so a worse thing, a child of human fancy must needs be urged instead.

O ye professed exponents of divine law, will you not believe God? Must you insist on teaching for doctrine the commandments of men? Will you never recover from the "blindness in part" which "has happened unto" Christendom? Be not wise above what is written. When God says "unto the wicked, O wicked man, thou shalt surely die," do not insist that the tempter's words, "thou shalt not surely die," are true. Point unbelievers to the coming of Christ, and warn them to be on the Lord's side in that terrible day. Point believers there, too, as an event which must *precede* the fruition of their hopes. Do you say, "The doctrine of Christ's second coming has become unpopular by reason of the extravagances and inconsistencies of some of its supporters?" We grant that reproach has thus been brought upon the cause; but, we ask, what truth has not had inconsistent supporters? Faithful John Fletcher said on this subject: "I know many have been grossly mistaken as to years, but because they were rash, shall we be stupid? Because they said, 'to-day,' shall we say 'never,' and cry 'peace, peace,' when we should look about us with eyes full of expectation?" We would that these words of Fletcher's might be written over

every pulpit in the land, for peradventure some might be by them spurred to the performance of long neglected duty.

Sir Isaac Newton, in his work on the prophecies, said, "there is scarcely a prophecy of the Old Testament which does not in something or other relate to the *second coming of Christ.*"

The world "lieth in wickedness." Iniquity is so triumphant that they who insist that all mankind will be converted to Christ before his return, deplore in confusion and dismay its alarming increase, and agonize over its abounding. It will so continue, and change not. "Evil men will wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." Beseech the people, therefore, and "by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him," exhort them to constancy. Direct them to that event, and the attendant reward of saints, as the ever-brightening star of gospel hope, and "crown of rejoicing."

The angelic announcement concerning Jesus was: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."—Luke i. 32–33. Let no man suppose this prophecy has reference to Chirst's first coming merely, for the circumstances of his first advent were such that it most assuredly did not meet the terms of the announcement. He did not then re-receive the throne of his father David, but was cast out and put to death. His first coming was to a brief life of humility and grief; but when next he

comes it will be to occupy the throne of eternal power and great glory. He then "came to his own and his own received him not;" soon he will come to be welcomed by his tried ones with songs of everlasting triumph. He was then not seen to possess comeliness or beauty that they should desire him; soon "he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe."

How truly marvelous is it that religionists should allow any thing, much less a heathen doctrine, to obscure the glorious light of the great truth of Christ's second coming. The patriarchs were favored with visions of it, and they rejoiced exceedingly. The prophets prophecied of it, telling its glories in loftiest strains. Jesus himself taught it abundantly, and his followers, catching up the blessed and sanctifying theme, made it the burden of apostolic preaching, and set it up as the great bell of liberty, joyfully ringing out the birth of redemption to every child of the living God. Heavenly beacon, it has cheered the suffering saints amid all the angry storms of suffering, and terrible tempests of persecution that have howled about them and beat upon them.

Though the signs of the near approach of Christ's return are so numerous and clear that universal attention should be directed to them and it, all, save a few watching ones, are unmindful of it. But this very state of things was foretold. "For as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not, until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall

also the coming of the Son of man be."—Matt. xxiv. 38, 39. Truly it is now as then. Each one chases his favorite phantom, and thinks not of the all-important impending event. That the *world* should occupy such a position is to be expected; but that the *Church* should be to such an extent unmindful is indeed a mournful spectacle.

Church of the living God! Take warning. Let all loins be girt about, and all lamps burning. Stand ye all as men ready and waiting to go forth to meet our returning Lord. The brightening streams that gild the eastern horizon tell us that the long dark night of waiting is about to give place to glorious, eternal day. Soon will "the Redeemer come to Zion;" and then will the redeemed come there with songs of everlasting joy. "Yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry."—Heb. x. 37. "Behold, I come quickly: and my reward is with me."—Rev. xxii. 12. Watch, therefore, . . . for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of man cometh."

"And who is He? the vast, the awful form. (Rev. x. 1, 2).
Girt with the whirlwind, sandall'd with the storm!
A western cloud around his limbs is spread,
His crown a rainbow, and the sun his head.
To highest heaven he lifts his kingly hand,
And treads at once the ocean and the land:
And hark! His voice amidst the thunder's roar,
His dreadful voice, that time shall be no more.
Lo! thrones are set, and every saint is there (Rev. xx. 6).
Earth's utmost bounds confess their awful sway,
The mountains worship, and the isles obey:
Nor sun, nor moon they need—nor day, nor night;—
God is their temple, and the Lamb their light. (Rev. xxi. 22);
And shall not Israel's sons exulting come,
Hail the glad beam, and claim their ancient home?

On David's throne shall David's offspring reign,
And the dry bones be warm with life again. (Ezek. xxvii).
Hark; white-robed crowds their deep hosannas raise,
And the hoarse flood resounds the sound of praise;
Ten thousand harps attune the mystic song,
Ten thousand thousand saints the strain prolong!
Worthy the Lamb, omnipotent to save,
Who died, who lives triumphant o'er the grave."

INDEX.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.—THE PENALTY OF SIN.

Penalties always stated in plain terms, 9.—Proportionate to the offense, 9.—Divine laws expressed in unmistakable terms, 9, 10.—Inconsistency of supposing the Edenic penalty was spiritual death or eternal suffering, 10, 11.—Query of John Foster, 11.—Remarks by Dr. John Locke, 12.—Adam understood the penalty to be literal death, 12.—Paraphrase, by Lange, of the tempter's language, 13.—Do., by Adam Clarke, 13.—Nature of the death threatened clearly shown, 15–17.—Not spiritual death: Christ did not suffer it, 18, 19.—Christ suffered literal death, 20–22.—Remarks by Adam Clarke on "dust thou art," etc., 23.—What Bishop Law says on the subject, 24, 25.—Inconsistencies exposed, 26, 27.

CHAPTER II.

MATT. X. 28 CONSIDERED.

Bible meaning of soul, 31.—Testimony of Dr. Parkhurst, 32.—Dr. Adam Clarke on Matt. xvi. 25, 26, 36.—Dr. Lange on the New Testament use of "sleep," 37.—What Dr. Hodge says on Rom. viii. 11, 37, 38.—Harwood on Matt. x. 28, 39.—Extract from *Theology of Bible*, 39, 40.—Do. from *Bible vs. Tradition*, 41, 42.—Meaning of "hell," in the text, 41.—Testimony of Dr. Richard Watson, 50.—Remarks by Prof. Hudson, 50.—Remarks by Thomas Read, author of *Bible vs. Tradition*, 52, 53.

CHAPTER III.

Acts xxiv. 15 Considered.

Quotation from Dr. Alexander, 57.—Do. 59.—Paul and the Pharisees, 60-63.—Extract from *Theology of the Bible*, 62.

CHAPTER IV.

The Penitent Thief.

Remarks by Drs. Clarke, Barnes, and Owen, 65.—Paradise does not now exist, but will, 66.—When? 68.—Testimony of Clarke, 71.—Paradise and the "third heaven" co-existent, 73.—Jesus descended into Sheol (hell), 74.—Meaning of Sheol, 74.—How Tremellius rendered it, 74.—Murdock's Syriac translation of Acts ii. 31, 32, 78.—What Dr. Lange says, 81.—What Whately says, 81.

CHAPTER V.

2 Cor. v. 1-9 Considered.

Unjust imputations noticed, 84, 85.—Remarks by Dr. Lange, 87.—Quotations from an English writer, 88.—Arguments by Archbishop Whately, 89.—Arguments by Milton, 89, 90.—Arguments by Belsham, 91.—The texts as rendered in Lange's Commentary, 92.—What Dr. Priestly says, 92.

PART II.

Stephen's Case Examined (Acts vii. 59. 60), 93.

PART III.

Outward Man, and Inward Man, (2 Cor. iv.)

Observations by Lange, 99.—What is the inward man? 100.—What Dr. Clarke says about it, 101.

CHAPTER VI.

Paul's Desire to Depart, (Phil. i. 20-24.)

Translation the object of his desire, 105.—Remarks by Belsham, 106.—Remarks by Dr. Priestly, 106, 107.—Remarks by Bishop Law, 107.—Remarks by Milton, 107.—Remarks by Whately, 108.

PART II.

In the Body, or Out of the Body, (2 Cor. xii. 2.)

A dilemma, 113.—An English writer's way of getting out of it, 113.—Remarks of Mr. Lee concerning "inspiration," 114.

PART III.

John v. 28, 29, 115.

CHAPTER VII.

The Transfiguration, (Matt. xvii. 1-3.)

What Adam Clarke says, 123.—What Prof. Mattison says, 124.

PART II.

"Supposed they had seen a Spirit," 125.

PART III.

Luke xx. 37, 38, Examined.

Arguments of Mr. Landis, 127.—Their fallacies exposed, 128, 129.—Advice of Justyn Martyr, 129.—Testimony of Wm. Tyndale, 129.—Testimony of Darby, 129.—God's promise to the Patriarchs, 131.—God's promise to Moses, 131.—The promises not yet fulfilled, 132.

CHAPTER VIII.

Parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke xvi.)

Parable of the trees, 137.—Parable of the eagles, 138.—What Dr. Adam Clarke says of parables in general, 140.—What Whitly says of the parable, 140.—What Lightfoot says, 141.—What Wakefield says, 141.—Remarks by Theophylact, 142.—Remarks by Dr. Gill, 144.—Remarks by James Bate, M. A., 145.

PART II.

Dan. xii. 2 considered.

View of Aben Ezra, 150.—Thomas Read says, 151.—Rabbi Saadias Gaon says, 151.—What Dr. Osbon says of the passage, 152.

CHAPTER IX.

IMMORTAL—IMMORTALITY—ETERNAL LIFE.

Principles of interpretation stated by Richard Watson, 153.—Do by Jeremy Taylor, 153.—Do by Hooker, 153.—Inconsistencies exposed, 156–161.—What Watson says of consciousness, 162.—What he says concerning the source ot life, 163.—Testimony of Darby, 163.—Remarks by Archbishop Whately, 164.

CHAPTER X.

EVERLASTING MISERY.

A popular fallacy considered, 169–170.—Letter of Heinfetter to the members of the American Bible Union, 170.

PART II. (OF BOOK.)

CHAPTER XI.

THE WICKED PERISH.

Important admission by John Wesley, 180.—Admission by Lange, 181.—Extract from an old English writer, 184.—Extract from Dr. Priestly, 184–185.—Paul's faith, 185–187.

CHAPTER XII.

THE WICKED SHALL BE DESTROYED.

Old Testament proof, 190–196.—New Testament proof, 196–200.—Death the doom of the finally impenitent, 201.

CHAPTER XIII.

DEVOURED—CONSUMED.

Extract from *Bible vs. Tradition*, 203–205.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE WICKED WILL BE BURNED.

Various arguments, 206–211.—Important admission by Dr. Clarke, 209.—What Dr. Whedon says, 212.

CHAPTER XV.

WHAT POPULAR THEOLOGY DOES WITH SINNERS.

Remarks by Dr. Clarke on the word *hell*, 213.—*Bible vs. Tradition* on the word *hell*, 213.—Testimony of Hezekiah, 215.—Testimony of Jacob, 216.—Benson on future state of wicked, 218.—Dr.

Edwards on future condition of wicked, 218.—Mr. Spurgeon on future condition of wicked, 219.—Stanza by Dr. Watts, 220.—Sanrin's experience, 221.—Effect of believing the doctrine, 223.—Admission by Dr. Curry, 223.—Address to preachers, of various churches, 223-224.—The torment doctrine not salutary, 226.—Remarks by Dr. Dwight, 229.—Remarks by Bishop Newton, 229.—Remarks by Dr. Edward Beecher, 230.

CHAPTER XVI.

The Doctrine of Inherent Immortality.

Admission of Bishop Watson, 234,—what Richard Watson says, 234.—What Archbishop Whately says, 235.—What Olshausen says, 235.—What Dr. Proudfit says, 235.—Admission of Bishop Tilotson, 235.—Decree of the Council under Pope Leo X., 236.—What Luther said of it, 237.—Arguments of Wm. Tyndale, 238.—Remarks by J. Panton Ham concerning Leo X, 239.—Doctrine of Indulgence stated, 241.—Increase of the trafic, and why, 242.—Extract from *D'Aubigne's Reformation*, 243.—Admission of a noted orthodox writer, 245.—The Egyptians the originators of the doctrine, 246.—Testimony of Herodotus, 247.—Testimony of Bunsen, 247.—Statements by Richard Watson, 248.—Remarks by Bishop Warburton, 248—Remarks by Isaac Taylor, 248.—What James Hogg says, 249.—What Dalton says, 250.—Remarks by Tytler, the historian, 251.—Pythagoras, Socrates, Cicero and Plato as advocates of inherent immortality.---254-5.---What Prideaux says concerning the belief of the Pharisees, 255.---Immortality of the soul not generally believed by the ancients, 257.

CHAPTER XVII.

Scripture Motive to Obedience and Faithfulness.

Fulfilment of gospel promises dependent upon the coming of Christ, 259,---Scripture motive to repentance, 260;---to mortification of animal lusts, 261;---to general obedience and holiness. 261;---to spiritual mindedness, 262;---to deeds of kindness and charity, 263; and to patience, long-suffering, and watchfulness, 263.---General remarks, 264-268.

H 148 82

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: August 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
00027716350